

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Golden Gate Club

January 9, 2001

7:15 p.m.

MR. KERN: Good evening everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. Happy New Year. Welcome everyone to the year 2001, to another series of meetings on cleanup of the Presidio. I would like to welcome the Presidio Trust and their contractors, the National Park Service representatives, the regulators that are here tonight, community RAB members, and any members of the public that are here tonight. Thanks for coming out.

Does everybody have an agenda? Are there any changes or additions on the agenda tonight?

MR. NELSON: One minor change, Jim is not here, He is not feeling well.

MR. KERN: Without objection we will move ahead with the agenda. Are there any announcements?

MS. REACKHOF: It is with very much pleasure that I am pleased to announce the Trust has a new Community Relations Specialist, who will be working with all of you. Her name is Jane Packer. She brings a lot of experience to the table. Jane, if you wanted to give the RAB members a little -- some information, go ahead.

1

♀

MS. PACKER: Most recently I was working for the

the Public Policy Institute of California, which is basically a politically-based think tank here in San Francisco similar to RAND. What they do is represent research we just did. We focused on California issues and I did the public affairs for them, the public relations community relations.

And I worked freelance for Senator Barbara Boxer. I did the public affairs, events, scheduling with her with the state, her traveling. I am excited to be here. Today is my second day at work, so I need to get up to speed on a few things, but I am excited and I look forward to meeting all of you at some point. Thanks.

MR. KERN: Jane, on behalf of the RAB welcome to the group, and I am sure you will get to know all of us. It is a pretty active group and they will be calling and emailing at rapid fire I am sure.

Any other announcements today? Next is committee reports.

MR. YOUNGKIN: We did not have our regularly monthly RAB meeting of December, but looking back we did have meetings in December. We had a RAB walking group meeting on -- wait a minute. That was way back there.

We had an FS working meeting on November 28th. We had a RAB working meeting on December 7th. At that meeting we

talked about Landfill E, and then on December 12th we had a progress meeting, which was a daytime meeting. It was a regularly scheduled meeting. We didn't have our regularly scheduled monthly RAB committee meeting.

MR. KERN: We met at the coffee shop, actually, a
Page 2

few of us did. So it was an informal committee meeting, and I guess -- does anybody that was there like to speak? I was there, but if someone who was there wants to speak, that is fine.

MS. WRIGHT: Oh, to give a report?

MR. KERN: See what happens when you raise your hand.

MS. WRIGHT: I thought you wanted to know who was there. It was a great meeting. I came and so did Jerry and Matt. We had a terrific discussion. We missed the rest of you. We just kind of talked about the overview of how things have been going, and the dialogue that we have been having through the several Tuesday meetings over the last couple of months. We were looking for really kind of an overview, a summary of how things are going. And we talked about some possibilities of what to do next.

Sorry to be so vague, but I don't have my notes with me.

MR. KERN: One of the things that was discussed near the end of the meeting was should we pick up on one of

3

♀

the suggestions that was made to write a letter. The group decided that we should write a letter of some sort, and we have been passing that around with the RAB members, and we have that to discuss this evening. So that was another thing the group came up with.

Anything else on that committee meeting?

Then we are ready to move on to Item Number 5, RAB follow-up on Main Installation sites stakeholder remedy

discussions. And we have at least a draft letter we would like to pass around this evening. And we will discuss it since nobody has really seen it. We RAB members have seen it. It is really not open for discussion. We are going to deal with it. If there are any extras, if there is anyone in the audience that would like to have one that's fine.

So I think it would be appropriate just for people to have a few minutes to review it. There have been changes coming in from all sectors. It has had a few revisions. And just so I don't interrupt you while you are reading, there is no preconception of what we will do with this or where we will send it. We will send it to whoever and whatever needs discussion. And it is wide open. People should feel free to comment on it in any way. So have a crack at it.

Does anyone need any more time? Okay. Then, are there any comments?

4

♀

MR. ANDERSON: I am just wondering if it would be helpful to include in the letter sort of our policy statements as to why we might have concerns, such as those listed in the table. For example, do the funds available for cleanup, would they allow for a more adequate or in-depth cleanup that would, number 2, address the environmental issues that we would be interested in; for example, maintaining them for Tennessee Hollow or things of that sort, which are more in the nature of generic issues that might be discussed.

I just wondered if focusing on the list of specific differences doesn't come across as a little dry and

technical and perhaps arbitrary.

MR. KERN: Any responses or thoughts from Jerry's comment? It is supposed to be kind of an open discussion. I know one of the things that we did some years ago now was there was a policy, a resolution, that the Restoration Advisory Board adopted with respect to landfills. So it could be an attachment to this possibly.

MR. NELSON: You had mentioned something about funds, and I don't think I understood the context of that question.

MR. ANDERSON: Maybe it is just me, but I don't know that we know yet whether decisions about less expensive or more expensive treatment of a particular site

5

♀

was chosen because there aren't funds or would the funds allow the more expensive treatment.

MR. NELSON: I see.

MR. DOWNING: I don't know the policy or the documents that you are referring to. I think -- in general I think it is a pretty good letter. I think maybe an appropriate way to cover what Jerry was talking about would be an attachment, you know, without, I guess -- otherwise I sort of see running the risk of spanning this into a fairly lengthy document, which isn't necessarily bad, but I think sort of -- if I understand with not having attended a couple of the meetings, I think my understanding is that the intent is to try to summarize the differences at this point in time, and indicate that we have had some good discussions, and maybe there is more to come unless

there is a different opinion. Maybe Jerry has a different intent.

MR. KERN: Okay.

MR. BERMAN: There's a different philosophy here. What Dennis is saying and Jerry is saying are different. Jerry is saying, I think, is what are the principles behind this letter? What are the principles that define these actions? And I think that memo or that resolution that we passed a few years ago actually address that. Whereas, I think Dennis is saying well, this is a particular study

6

♀

that has been going on and here are our comments at this point here.

The question is whether it is something that needs to have the principles to be able to say in the letter or comments about participation. To me as a person that has been involved in this, I think I could go either way on it. One is sort of the high ground -- here are our principles. And one is sort of the new-color ground -- we have been working on this and here are a few comments. It could go either way and, I guess this is something that maybe RAB members ought to think about and have discussion about. But I personally think you could do it either way depending upon each person's taste.

MR. KERN: Are there any other copies of the letter floating around?

MR. BERMAN: I was thinking through this a few times, and I would very much like or hope this evening that -- I don't have a mike, so maybe it is hard to hear. There are very high ceilings here, so the best acoustics are up

there at Lamp Level.

I would hope that there has been enough time for the other members, other than the community members, especially the Trust personnel that are here, if they are willing to give any comments about this letter in principle or in detail, I think it would be very valuable. I don't know

7

♀
†

whether they feel like doing that here at this moment, but sometime I think it is extremely valuable for us when there are differences of opinion to know where we go from here on this in a sense.

So, therefore, I would hope that there would be some response. I don't know whether they are willing to do this, or expected this this evening, or am I completely out of line here. If I am just point me to the door.

MR. KERN: Well, we can certainly point you to the door in any case, but I think it is truly at their option. If they feel comfortable commenting on it that is fine, but I don't expect they would have to respond.

MS. REACKHOF: Obviously we have really appreciate all of the meetings and dialogue of the RAB and the Trust and the Park Services and all stakeholders have had over the last few months. And we listen very closely to all of the comments that have come forth. We have had very open and very positive discussions during that time as we are moving forward with trying to reach some resolution on even just some of the components of the draft Feasibility Study.

We need to now work at another level, which is, you know, working with the RAB and getting some of their

comments down on paper such as this for us to take into consideration. Obviously, just having seen this, you know, to provide that to the Trust Board to look at as they are

8

♀

working through some of the reuse and other issues that are going on -- I know that there will be further discussions with the RAB and the Park Service and senior management and the Trust Board in the very near term as we all try and reach some resolutions on some of these issues. So as to any specific comments on these sites, I really don't have any at the moment, Sam, but I want to be very supportive of the way the RAB has been working through this, and I appreciate their candor, and look forward to getting these problems resolved in a timely manner.

MR. BERMAN: I appreciate that.

MR. FORD: If I can follow-up on that. I know as a Trust employee I would say that I would welcome any comments. If you have statements on policy or important considerations or things that you are really interested in, I think that would be helpful to include that or attach that to this letter just because of the way it works. I mean, as Trust employees we are looking at alternatives and turning them over and trying to compare them with each other, and sometimes it is a little -- we may have some trouble understanding why, say, the RAB would prefer a certain remedy over a lower-cost remedy or different remedies that appear to be protective.

And so, you know, basically any information that you can provide helps us understand, or that will help us

9

♀

understand why you prefer a different remedy other than the low-cost one. I think is a good thing. I mean, it is helpful to us, and it helps us understand your position. So, I mean, I vote for including it.

MS. CHEEVER: Well, I don't know if it is something that could be said or not. If it is appropriate to ask, can one say to what extent the Trust will work with the remediation as opposed to the staff that is here involved in environmental remediation at this particular moment?

MS. REACKHOF: We all work together as a team by the information provided to them. Even though they are not attending these meetings on a regular basis, we are keeping senior management up to speed. They do have that opportunity to hear some of the Trust Board members. So they have been actively involved. They are obviously very aware of what is going on with the remediation program from day one.

MR. FORD: I would say as a practical matter, the way the Board works is they don't consider environmental matters every day, at every meeting. It is sort of -- I mean, I think they work like any other board. They have topics of great interest to them and those tend to be the very big money topics, and things like the remediation sort of go up and down in importance over periods of time.

10

♀

So I think they have been considering remediation

issues and looking at costs and considering costs recently, but, you know, they don't do it at a constant level.

MR. O'HARA: I think George's point is well-taken, and our assurance is we are submitting these products of our discussions with the Trust and the regulators. George has said that it would be helpful if we could substantiate our position by including a reason for our decision or our opinions, and the matter of substance would be a policy that we have. And I am assuming that the Trust receives our remarks as part of a much wider pool of comments that come in, and that they wrestle with their own philosophy versus the opinions and thoughts of others. And I don't think that at this particular point anything further in terms of comments is necessarily appropriate for the Trust at this point because what you have got is what you have got.

And I would recommend that the RAB substantiate the letter with our reasons and our policies on why we have these opinions.

MR. KERN: Any other thoughts? We do have a landfill resolution I can send around to people for their review and see if that still meets that. This might be worth reviewing to see whether it is current, given that we did that with the Army and we have had a number of new RAB

11

♀
†

members come on board. So it might be worth reviewing that.

MR. O'HARA: One issue was mentioned here and that is the procedure of the Trust Implementation Plan and various alternatives that are being proposed. And I

suppose I have got a question to the extent that, are the remediation proposals that the Trust is making consistent in every case with each of the alternatives that the Trust is currently considering for the alternative inspirations for the use of company property?

MR. FORD: We think they are, but the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan is sort of a guidance level plan. It doesn't focus down to the level of specific recommendations for an individual site. So, you know, I guess the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan has got a lot of flexibility in the way -- whatever plan is adopted is or finally is performed, they are consistent.

I mean, we believe they are -- we expect that the remedies will be consistent with what comes out of the media, but that is going to be kind of an interactive process where some of the recommendations may have to be adjusted to match the remedies.

MS. WRIGHT: George, I had a question. And I think, Peter, that is a great question. It seems like sometimes the alternative that is chosen might determine

12

♀

reuse. It may determine situations where we don't know what is going on. Obviously, we have some sites that would be directly involved. I guess this has come up before. I am trying to figure out, is that a reason to argue for a specific remedy for most options since obviously that time frame is different, or is that not the only factor in consideration?

MR. FORD: I don't know if there is a yes or no

answer to your point. I mean, I think it is -- I see it as an interactive process in that the remedies that are selected are ones that are implemented. They will affect the reuse of that site. I mean, there is no question that is true. And so, I guess, what I am saying is the -- at any individual site future reuse considerations are something that ought to be considered in selecting a remedy, but I think the flip side of that is that it can't -- you know, future reuse of that site is one factor to be considered. It isn't the sole criteria I think you could use to pick one remedy over another.

MS. WRIGHT: Especially if the proposed alternative is on this point rather than on another issue.

MR. FORD: I can tell you as sort of remediation professionals, what we have to be careful about is spending most of the money on some super-clean remedies for reuse that could, you know, be 20 or 30 years out, or it may

13

♀

never happen at all. I mean those are the kind of things that have to be balanced.

MS. WRIGHT: I recognize that. On the other hand, though, we do reuse it. I mean, I can see that both ways expensive.

MR. FORD: If you do the quick and dirty remedy, that is frequently going to have an impact on the possible reuse. So, I think it is something we have to talk about and hope we land somewhere in the middle.

MR. KERN: Other comments at this point?

MR. KINGSTON: I have to apologize because I left for a few minutes and I didn't hear what you started out

with, but did you talk about the fact that you and Mark are going to meet with the Trust tomorrow?

MR. KERN: We did not, no.

MR. KINGSTON: I would like to encourage you to talk about specifics rather than philosophy. The Trust is going to meet with Mark and Doug tomorrow to try to fully understand where the RAB is coming from, not philosophically, but specifically site by site, and whether there is any disagreement with the Trust.

It is scheduled. I am not positive it is going to happen, but they are scheduled to have a presentation from the Trust to the Board on Friday outlining different stakeholders' opinions, and what the Trust would

14

♀

recommended. So if we talk philosophy all night long I don't know if we are going to further the cause of getting your specific recommendations and concerns to the Board. This is not once it is done, it is all over and there is no more speaking, but I would encourage you to be more specific than philosophical tonight.

MR. KERN: Would you recommend that we get a letter in sooner than later to affect this meeting on Friday if possible.

MR. KINGSTON: Like I said, Doug, it is not like it is all over tomorrow or Friday, but I would encourage you to be specific.

MS. WRIGHT: That is great news, and also sort of brings up we still don't have a recent letter. Is that something we should discuss here and now? I don't know --

based on what you are saying it would be appropriate in that sense to address this to the Trust, or should we -- I was thinking we should address it to the staff because of our working relationship with the staff, or does it matter in your opinion?

MR. KINGSTON: I think it is appropriate to address it to Sharron.

MS. WRIGHT: That is what I was thinking.

MR. KINGSTON: So right now we are talking about addressing the letter. Thank you for bringing that up.

15

♀

Are there any other thoughts?

MR. O'HARA: I think the letter does what this gentleman is suggesting. It is issue-specific and it is site-specific, but I think what George has said is basically you may have an opinion about this particular site that differs from the Trust's opinion and that is okay, but we would like to know why. And we have made statements to the effect that this is what we would like to see and I think the philosophical aspect of it is the backup or rationale for taking the opinion that we are.

The other thing that I am missing here is what is the timing on this? I mean does this letter and support documents have to hit somebody's desk by 8:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, or when are you folks making your recommendations to the Board?

MR. NELSON: Well, the Feasibility Study process is still ongoing. So in my opinion as long as the Feasibility Study process is ongoing and we are discussing these remedies this is a letter that doesn't, as Tom said,

have a definitive end to it, you know. I think the meeting that the Trust and the RAB are having tomorrow is going to be very important in terms of what is presented on Friday to the Board and how it happens.

But just to reiterate what Tom said, it is not the last opportunity to address these concerns. This could be

16

♀
†

something you attach to all the RAB comments on the FS perhaps if after you see the document you haven't gotten some of the resolution that you are looking for out of this. But maybe Tom you want to add something to that? By the way, I don't think there is a drop dead date to when we need to send this. We are not in the public comment period or anything, so there is no clock that is ticking.

MR. KERN: I think -- allow me to at least say the genesis of why we put the letter together is it wasn't to respond to potential Board meetings. We had been through our series of meetings, and we were in a certain place in trying to decide what we should do with that information. We made an effort in this letter to summarize that essentially based on your comment, Sam, at the last meeting when you said we should put this in writing. So the group met and that is what they decided to do.

So now there are some meetings happening. You know, this is a deliberative body. I think we should take the time that people feel they need. If there are people that feel that this needs to be substantiated and it has a philosophy behind it, let's continue to talk about that. And if people want to respond or get a discussion going we

will do that. The purpose of the draft to get to the decision makers by Friday is to have another option for informational purposes.

17

♀

There are a variety of openings available to us, and I think since we are not actually commenting on a document. We are commenting in an open fashion on discussions that we have had -- very open and candid discussions with the Trust who made that available to us. And this is a means of communicating that back to them, hopefully in an effective way. So I will put that out there for your consideration. There were a couple of other comments over on this side of the room.

MS. CHEEVER: I was going to say something similar to what you are saying. It seems to me if there is definitely a meeting of the which the Trust Board is getting a presentation on stakeholder views and concerns on Friday that, obviously, we should finish a version of this letter by Friday or in time for it to be part of the information that goes into the meeting. I am not quite sure how we would go about handing this to the Board for substantiation or explanation for the six sites that are discussed, but I definitely think we should do something right this week.

MR. KINGSTON: You know I think Chris made a very good point. Though this is not the end when the Trust makes a presentation to the Board. This is an update to the Board where this group has been going for the last few months. It is not an end all and do all, but we welcome

18

♀

input. And if you could be as specific as you can, it would be gratifying.

MS. CHEEVER: I think I understand that. That is what I said. I said sending a version of the letter, since we have put the effort into the letter, seems like a good point.

MR. KERN: Any other reactions to the developing environment?

MR. BERMAN: I hope that you realize that the community RAB members are kind of having a meeting in the public because we haven't have time to review this separately, together, or all at once except in communicating through emails. So a certain amount of discussion here is Doug is faced with hearing comments from the community members that he has never heard before. And so this is somewhat of a meeting within a meeting.

So with that consideration I have an alternate decision to what Julie is saying, because it would seem to me that there was this meeting on Friday, and that it would be nice in maintaining our mutual blend of working together, that if it was appropriate that you can let the Board know that the RAB has actually communicated some of their thoughts with you. Maybe not necessarily that we prepared a letter to have at the time, but that since there is a question about stakeholders, it would be valuable and appreciated by

19

♀

me and perhaps other members of the community members if

the issue came up as to whether you are hearing from the outside to refer to this letter as a result of these meetings.

Now it is possible that there might be a request to see this letter, in which case we could work on it and then we know who to address it to, and essentially make it more specific if there was a response to this. I don't know how you feel about that, Tom, but I am merely putting the ball in your court.

MR. KINGSTON: I guess, George and Sharron have said we would like to hear your response and your reasons for where you wanted to go with each site. And, you know, this is only a thought process for us for what we want to do. The agencies have the final say on what is acceptable.

MR. BERMAN: I was only speaking procedurally. I think your comment is well taken and we understand this process is ongoing. But the question is, procedurally, should we try to get something formally into this meeting on Friday. And I was suggesting it would be nice in the spirit of our mutual and congenial working together -- if it was appropriate you could bring up the fact that such a letter of communication exists.

MS. REACKHOF: If I could respond to that. You know, as Chris mentioned, this is a very long process. I

20

♀
†

can guarantee you these kind of resolutions and letters need some time, and they do need your input. And you all have put so much into the process you do not need to feel you need to rush through this.

I think that definitely we are going to be meeting with
Page 18

the Board on Friday. We are taking with us all the information that we have gathered from you, and all the positive, you know, different aspects of your comments that you provided over the period of the last three or four months. And in no way because we don't have a letter of this sort in hand, would that not be voiced to the Board members because you all have been doing an incredible job and spending a lot of your personal time on these issues. And you have a lot of interest in the care of the Presidio, and that is definitely going to be something that I will share with the Board members. So the time that you need on any kind of a correspondence to us, you should never feel rushed on it.

MR. HULTGREN: I am not sure if I understand the problem here. Let me see if it is something like this. The Trust Board is meeting on Friday to review the progress of the environmental remediation. And I assume that that will be a meeting with staff and input from staff. This letter is intended to tell the Board that while we are satisfied with some of the proposals for some of the

21

♀

remediation issues, there are others that we still have questions about, and we have enumerated six of those here, so that the Board won't assume that everything is swell and that the RAB is in complete agreement with everything that is said.

In fact, we are keeping the door open to the fact that there are still issues to be discussed and to be resolved, we hope between us and the staff, or at least to be

thoroughly discussed, and perhaps not agreed upon in the future. In which event we would have our own independent proposal for those particular issues; is that it? I just want to advise the Trust that that is the situation.

MR. KERN: That seems to be a very appropriate encapsulation of what we are trying to do.

MR. HULTGREN: I don't think it is necessary, although I think at some point we should be more specific and explain -- as we said in the next to the last paragraph -- explain to the Board the reasoning behind our proposals. I don't think that is necessarily quite appropriate at this time. They just want to tell the Board that there are issues that we want to discuss further and we have reasons for our position on those issues in the future.

MR. KERN: Thank you.

MR. HULTGREN: If that is the case, it seems to me the letter is pretty good.

22

♀

MR. ANDERSON: Is there any problem with just some representation from the Board -- from the RAB appearing with the staff at the Friday meeting, just by agreement, not by soliciting an invitation? Is the staff interested?

MS. REACKHOF: At this time I think we are meeting with Doug and Mark tomorrow and some very senior management at the Trust level. And I believe that there has not been really a true briefing from the staff to the Board. And I would like to have that opportunity to do that at first. And I think that as we follow on with the process there will probably be very much opportunity for a RAB member to be present there.

MR. ANDERSON: So you are suggesting that the RAB not be represented on Friday?

MS. REACKHOF: I don't think Friday would be necessarily productive. It is more of the Trust staff update to the Board, and there would be another meeting this week that there would be an opportunity for the RAB to meet with the senior staff. As we move through the process, I am sure those opportunities would arise.

MR. ANDERSON: I thought Tom was suggesting that it might work out to have RAB representation on Friday.

MR. KINGSTON: I missed a little bit of what you said Jerry.

MR. ANDERSON: I thought you were suggesting that

23

♀

it would be possible or maybe even likely that the RAB would be represented at the meeting on Friday.

MR. KINGSTON: I think Sharron gave a very good description. It is a regular Board meeting on Friday, and a small portion of that meeting is an update by the staff to the Board on where we stand on different stakeholders and others on remediation for different sites. I would think a future date would be more appropriate for the RAB to be represented there.

One member of the Board has requested to come here very soon, to a RAB meeting, and we have to find out exactly what the agenda would be. But there will be interaction between the Board and the RAB.

MR. ANDERSON: I guess I misunderstood.

MR. FORD: Jerry, I think it would be better to --

I mean, these six points are not news to any of the Trust staff. This is going to be presented. The RAB's concerns with the proposed remedies on these sites are going to be explained to the Trust Board on Friday. I think just -- I haven't had a lot of experience with this Board, but I have had experience with other governing boards, and I think it would be to your advantage to sort of let these ideas -- we can present them to the Board and let them simmer for a while.

Let them get familiar with it, and then I am sure that

24

♀

the RAB can arrange to meet with the Board to either appear at a board meeting or some other venue at sometime a little bit down the road. And I think that would be more effective meeting because the Board at that point would be familiar with the RAB's concerns, and, you know, you wouldn't be starting from zero.

MR. O'HARA: I think we have beat this to death. What I am going to suggest is -- I will offer a motion that I will submit once you get a name and an address.

MR. KERN: I think it was recommended --

MR. O'HARA: I move that we submit the letter as written, and perhaps you could go out on the net and get the approval of those who need to sign off on it so you can submit the letter.

MS. WRIGHT: I completely agree, and it seems -- I think Jerry's suggestion is a fine one for down the road. I definitely think that for now this is clear up and an update meeting. I understand there won't be any major decisions made by the Presidio Board of directors on

Friday, so this seems like a great way to start on getting what we have now. We can start this week with the signatures of whichever members of the RAB would like to be on it.

MR. O'HARA: Is that a second?

MS. WRIGHT: Oh, yes, I second.

25

♀
†

MR. KERN: All right. Is there more discussion?

MS. CHEEVER: I would like to make one change and take out one sentence from Page 3. The sentence reads, "We would like the opportunity to explain to the Board." Did you want to amend the letter to take out that one sentence on Page 3? I am talking slowly because it echoes so much.

I thought we could change it to something like, "We would like the opportunity to explain to the Board."

MR. HULTGREN: No, I thought that was exactly what the letter said already. That is why we don't want to be more specific and give our reasons here. At least it explains we would like to reserve the right in the future.

MS. CHEEVER: I guess I didn't hear you right. Does anyone have any other changes not including comments that will be probably added later?

MR. KERN: First --

MR. YOUNGKIN: There won't be signatures on it, there will just be names, right, names of the people that send in or request to have their names on it? Or should it just be the general RAB?

MR. KERN: I think what we are doing right now is -- there is a motion on the floor and it has been

seconded. So we are now discussing just that particular item of whether to type in RAB members names at the end of this, or just general RAB reference, or an actual signed

26

♀

page.

MR. O'HARA: There may be people who want to abstain or disagree with it, so I would say that it doesn't hurt to include those names of the people who want to support it as long as you have got a quorum.

MR. KERN: We definitely have a quorum here tonight.

MR. HULTGREN: Would you call the question?

MR. KERN: Any further discussion?

MR. BERMAN: If we have decided to address this letter to Sharron, then, I believe there are some things in here which need to be modified from the words because it was unclear when I read the letter that it was going to go to a senior staff member, or to Trust staff, or to the members of the Board, or somebody else. And I think if we -- if there is a general consensus that the letter has to be directed to Sharron, I think it should be reread and rethought through.

I appreciate this letter and I am in favor of the letter, but in view of the choice of who it is addressed to, I think, there are some sentences in here that are not quite appropriate.

MR. KERN: Thank you for that discussion.

MR. BERMAN: I can point them out if you want to do that.

27

♀

MR. KERN: I think it would be reasonable to point it out. If we can get a consensus it is always preferable. If they are minor changes we may be able to amend the resolution.

MR. BERMAN: They are all relatively minor, but I think now we have an addressee, I think, you might want to say something slightly different.

MR. KERN: Okay. With the RAB's permission, can we proceed with that?

MR. O'HARA: I thought we were addressing the letter to the Board of Directors.

MR. BERMAN: You see, and those sentences in there -- there are some sentences in there that really don't belong in a letter to Sharron in my opinion and do belong in a letter to the Board.

MS. WRIGHT: Peter, I am sorry we can't hear you.

MR. O'HARA: My question was, are we not addressing this letter to the Board of Directors because I don't think Sharron needs to know what it is that we agree with or object to because she has been part of the meetings where this discussion has been taking place.

MR. BERMAN: Let me try to answer that. I think people are taking this letter a little bit out of context, and I am concerned about it. And I think the original idea was to have a formal record of our contributions to the

28

♀

many meetings, and -- correct me, please, if this is not

the original idea.

Now it seems to have grown in its political significance in some way perhaps because of this upcoming Board meeting. But I am very uncomfortable about that, and I am going to express my personal feelings. I think it is quite appropriate at this time to have a record of what happened at the meetings, and I think it is appropriate to address it to the Presidio staff, the Trust staff. And I think it is appropriate for them to bring it up in a meeting with the Trust Board of such activities going on, and that is one package now.

If other members of the RAB feel that they want to go beyond that, then -- I mean, the letter can't be addressed to Sharron. If it has to be addressed to a Board member -- this letter has the implication that somehow the Trust staff are not listening to us, which we think they are, but we want to make a record of that in asking them to bring it up at the Board meeting as an activity.

So, I mean, I really feel that -- I mean, I think we need to decide. I think we have to back off a minute because we have a resolution that has been seconded, and we have two different opinions as to who the letter is addressed to at this point. I think Tracy feels it was addressed to Sharron, and Peter feels it is addressed to a

29

♀
†

Board member.

MR. KERN: Yes, that seems to be the case now. Maybe if I can do an informal poll in the middle of this resolution just to sort of facilitate this, if you will allow me. How many people thought this was going to go to

Sharron?

MR. ANDERSON: Wait a second, thought it was going to her or thought it should go to her?

MR. KERN: Those are two different questions. Let's put it this way. How many people want this to go to Sharron? Please raise your hands. We have seven. And how many would prefer to direct it to the Board? So we have nine. Are those all the people? Is anybody not voting? Okay. So there is a little bit of a conflict there with some leaning towards sending it to the staff.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Just send it to the Trust.

MR. HULTGREN: Let's be more specific. The letter is framed to go to the Board. I mean, the language there seems appropriate to go to the Board with saying "make it our concern," so the Trust Board members might consider in their decision-making process issues currently being raised by community members. I mean, sure you can send that to Sharron, but the point of it is to apprise the Board of these facts. Don't beat around the bush. I mean, the whole thrust of this letter, the whole language of it

30

♀

requires for it to go to the Board. If you don't want it to go to the Board then draft a different letter.

MS. WRIGHT: Julian, I agree. I think it does and should and still can do that by sending it to Sharron as the person that we know that is going to be reporting issues to the Board. I don't know if this seems too simple particularly by sending it to Sharron and making the language more appropriate. Maybe we could ask her to CC

the Board, but I don't know. I think she going to be making the update.

My feeling is that this is just what Sam had said earlier. We are summarizing where we are in the process, where the differences lie. We are not at the end of the game here, and if we need to take further steps later, if we feel it is not going the way we were hoping it would -- then that's that. But I feel things are still really in the process. Things are going the way we were hoping they would, and we know there will be a Board update on Friday and Sharron will be representing the RAB. That is my thought.

MR. O'HARA: This is not a document that is intended to be critical or punitive. It is a document that is meant to be informative and to indicate to the Board that there are differences of opinion. And the Board may not agree with us, but I feel that it is reasonable and

31

♀

appropriate to let them know that at the end of the day, after these initial discussions, that we have taken a look at the same data and come to different conclusions, and that on that kind of a basis, there is no line in the sand, and there is no right or wrong. There is a difference of opinion and they are not major. They are simply differences of opinion for specific reasons. And I don't see that there is anything not appropriate about expressing those.

MS. WRIGHT: I agree. Sharron, you made a comment earlier. Was that for the group?

MS. REACKHOF: I was asking Doug about the other

resolution for 637. I don't know who they addressed it to. The bottom line is the Board is going to get it. I am going to give it to the Board. Any number of us will be giving it to the Board, however you all feel is comfortable. If you are trying to get it out in an expedited time frame without having to reword, making it out to the Presidio Board wouldn't be of any harm if we give it to the same people at the same time.

My mindset is, where do you want to give your direction to the Board, because when you start giving those impressions, this might just be where we are at in the process right now. Do you wait until you reach further resolutions rather than giving -- maybe sending these types

32

♀

of letters. So it is a sort of a decision on where you are in the process, or where you want to make strong statements. That is one thing to think about.

I guess the bottom line is, I guess, all this will go to the Trust Board and they will all have copies of this, whoever you address it to.

MS. CHEEVER: I agree with what Peter and Julian said. What if we said, "The Presidio Trust, care of Sharron Reackhof"? That is -- it is showing the Trust Sharron is to be the person in charge.

MR. HULTGREN: Send it to the Board through Sharron, which is the point.

MS. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. HULTGREN: Sharron will hand it to the Board, but it shows that it is intended for their information, not

for Sharron. I mean, she knows all of this.

MR. KERN: So let me get your proposed amendment to the letter. You want to address the letter, "For the purpose of the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron Reackhof"?

MS. WRIGHT: Care of Sharron Reackhof.

MR. KERN: "Care of Sharron Reackhof," okay. Right, okay. Sam, does that meet your needs, or does it still need to be reworded, or what is appropriate now?

MR. BERMAN: If you direct it to the Trust, then

33

♀

the rewording I was thinking of is probably inappropriate. But I still feel that procedurally you gain a certain amount of collegian by keeping this directed to Sharron personally, and rather than -- I really don't know the implications of this, but if I was in Sharron's place -- I think she is being very generous, and I think we should try to support her as much as possible, and not look like we are trying to undermine what she is doing until we feel that there is some real cause to do that.

MR. KERN: Dennis.

MR. DOWNING: I am opposed to editing a letter in a meeting like this, but I am in agreement with Sam. I originally thought the letter was being written and directed to the Trust Board. I think it is more appropriate, despite what you said, Sharron, that we address it to you. In the context of what you said, Sharron, the nature of our working together at various meetings, you know, I don't think that anything we are saying here is a surprise to you.

But my thought was that this would be going through you, or now we are talking about it I prefer that it be going through you since the context of the meeting is to convey various stakeholders' views. And that sort of thing that would seem like we would be saying, "Here is what we are talking about. Here is what we want, and here is what

34

♀
†

the RAB has proposed on a few sites." But again, I am not wild about trying to edit this letter and rewriting it, with that in mind.

MR. KERN: My own personal feeling is I also tend to agree with Sam that we have a relationship directly with Sharron and the staff here. We have spent many hours with them. I think it affords a measure of respect that we address it to the staff, and we know and understand the information that will be passed on. Does the letter sound like it is going to the Board? I mean, I think we are -- there is a little bit of discomfort around the table.

Let me take an informal poll again, if I might, just to see whether people feel like they could go with addressing this to Sharron rather than the Board through Sharron. We will see if we are there, or whether we have to go to the second option. So, who is in favor of to Sharron?

MS. YAROS: Are you talking about the letter as it is?

MR. ANDERSON: What are the choices?

MR. KERN: Address it to Sharron or to the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron.

MS. WRIGHT: I think there was a third option if I

understood correctly.

MS. CHEEVER: Address it to the Presidio Trust care of Sharron without using the word "or." I really like

35

♀

the discussion. It sort of makes it -- well, anyway.

MR. NELSON: If you would like to work on some language, I would glad to provide some of that to you directly so that you could get the process going.

MS. WRIGHT: Sharron said earlier they are a team. I don't think we should try to separate them. I think the Presidio Trust is who we are addressing it to, care of Sharron and addressed as -- well, we are addressing the Presidio Trust, not one versus the other.

MR. KERN: Let's see if we have a consensus or if we are getting to a consensus. How many vote for sending it to Sharron directly? How many people would like to address this directly to Sharron? Sharron doesn't get to vote. We have four. The second option is to the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron Reackhof. We have nine. And how many for the Presidio Trust, care of Sharron?

MR. NELSON: It is a government language thing.

MR. KERN: We are tending to lean towards the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron Reackhof. If we do that are we going to have a happy board here?

MS. WRIGHT: I will still second it.

MR. KERN: Is there any further discussion on this? So the resolution or the motion would be amended -- if you accept the amendment -- the letter will be addressed to the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron Reackhof.

36

♀

Would you accept such an amendment?

MR. O'HARA: I will accept that amendment.

MR. KERN: So are we at a place everyone can agree with? Is there any further discussion?

MR. BERMAN: One last point is I would like to just note -- someone tell me -- I mean I had a very explicit reason when I stated that I think it should go to Sharron and no one has stated a reason why they think that it should be directed towards the Trust care of Sharron. Could you perhaps just review that for me and tell me what it is?

MR. KERN: Yes. Of the nine of you that were interested in having this sent to the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron, would there be a spokesperson that would like to answer that?

MR. HULTGREN: One is, this is a message to the Trust, okay? It is not a message to Sharron. We want the Trust to see this -- the Board. That is the main reason it should go somehow to the Board. It is not a message to Sharron.

MR. BERMAN: I think we are at a fundamental difference here because the original idea of this letter was a summary of the activities. It wasn't supposed to be looked at as a challenge. If I was a Board member I would be uncomfortable with this letter not directed to the

37

♀

staff. It looks to me as if it is a challenge and I am

very strongly opposed to that at this moment. I mean, we may even actually feel that, for some reason, we need to do that at some point, but this is really burning a ship or maybe a stack of chips at an inappropriate time.

MR. KERN: Well, is there any further discussion? Now, if we vote on this it is important, I think, that we have some consensus. So I am a little bit reluctant to take a vote and have people oppose this letter just on the basis of who it is going to be addressed to because I think there is a sense in the group -- I am getting a very good sense that the letter is good, the information is good that is going to be delivered.

So I appreciate your comments though, Sam, I really do. And you are never reserved in your strong feelings, which is always appreciated. So, I don't know. Are you going to vote against this? Can you tell me that?

MR. BERMAN: I don't vote against the letter. I think procedurally it is just inappropriate to take it out of context. And so I am appealing to the -- I mean, I am appealing to the other community members here to think through the process that you are doing here and imagine yourself as being a Board member and seeing this directed to you.

It looks to me when you read it -- when you get a

letter like this, you always try to read between the lines on what is going on. There is a subliminal message here, which will be delivered by this letter if you address it to the Board. And I am uncomfortable with that subliminal message. I think it is inappropriate, and I have lost

elections before, but I wanted to state my opinions. I wanted to make it as clear as possible because I think there is an issue here of which there is a very important issue, and that is an issue of consideration, and of not delivering a subliminal message that you don't really want to deliver.

MR. KERN: Let me just take the additional time because I think you are raising an important point. Is there anybody that would like to resonate with what Sam is saying and share on what needs some input?

MS. MONAGHAN: I sort of feel like we are addressing something to senior management, and we are going through the staff chain of command, sending it to the senior body. Sending it through the staff position is typical in my organization, so this is very comfortable to me to send something to the Trust or senior management through staff persons. And when you send it through the staff person she is also going to be passing it on as something she acknowledges or agrees with, or at least acknowledges that this is going on.

39

♀

To me it is real comfortable. I understand what you are saying, but I don't feel like -- if we had mailed it to the Trust Board members directly and not sent Sharron a copy first, that would have been a declaration of war.

MR. BERMAN: But what do -- you began explain to me what you gain by sending it to the Trust Board care of Sharron instead of just sending it directly to Sharron.

MS. MONAGHAN: I think it is a sign of working

together. It will be recognized as a sign of sending it through.

MR. BERMAN: To me it has just the opposite -- just the entirely opposite feeling because as soon as you involve people that are your superiors in some way, even if it is a CC, you are indicating some kind of dissatisfaction. I mean, this is standard procedure. You write a letter to somebody and copy it to the person's boss. What you are doing is you are saying, "I want you to know I have got some strong feelings here, and I don't agree with what your staff is doing."

MS. WRIGHT: I agree that I don't think we are doing this right. What I would like to suggest is the possibility of on Page 2 adding, "We are grateful to the Trust personnel who have provided the opportunity for us to work with them in this technical review." And maybe we could lab rat on that to make it perfectly clear that we

40

♀

are working with the staff. And that may be a way to make sure there is no misunderstanding by addressing it to the Board because I think we all like the letter.

I think we are comfortable now the way we are addressing it that it is not going to be in any way received poorly. So, maybe if we emphasized our relationship in the letter with maybe an additional sentence or two that would work. Would that make you feel better about addressing it the way we are?

MR. BERMAN: I think what you do then is you give two messages, and I think you defeat yourself.

MS. RYAN: My name is Patricia Ryan. I work for
Page 36

the Department of Toxins with Bob. I go to a lot of RAB meetings in different facilities. I am not commenting on this letter, but I do know that the function of the RAB is to represent the concerns of the community, and sometimes they are quite in conflict with responsible parties or the military or the Trust. And really the job of the RAB is to bring these concerns forward, and sometimes toes get stepped on, but these things need to be discussed or brought into the open.

I think the Trust has a really great mechanism. I admire you. I use you as my model for how things can work efficiently because you are the most efficient RAB I work with. You need to remember language needs to be up front

41

♀

to move the thing along and you can't always worry about stepping on toes and subliminal messages. This letter signifies moving along in the process, and getting the public's concerns out there, and letting the Trust know how the public feels, and making sure it goes forward through Sharron or however you decide.

MR. KERN: Thank you for those comments. What I think we need to do is perhaps to move this and still reach a consensus -- one idea that I will throw out is perhaps the Trust staff will bring this to the meeting on Friday and could represent to the Board what happened here tonight, and how carefully this group deliberated, and the concerns around who it was addressed to. It wouldn't be there for posterity, but at least that could be transmitted somehow to the Board.

1-09-01.txt

Anyway, I think we have wrung this one out. So, I think we need to vote and see what happens. So, does everyone understand what we are voting on? We have this letter. We are addressing it to the Presidio Trust Board through Sharron Reackhof, Environmental Remediation Specialist or Project Manager, yes, very well. All those in favor, please raise your hand. Opposed -- one. Motion carries with one opposed.

I very much appreciate the deliberation of the body this evening and very much appreciate Sam's willingness to

42

♀

stand for his convictions. With that I think it would be appropriate for us to possibly to take a brief break, and we will reconvene for the rest of the meeting in ten minutes.

(Off the record)

(Off the record from 8:35 p.m. to 8:47 p.m.)

MR. KERN: The next item on the agenda --

MR. DOWNING: During the break, Doug -- not to reopen this again, but maybe to offer a suggestion, which was Tom's, is that in addition to the Board and to the staff, that we should also consider at least CCing a letter to the Park Service and DTSC as well.

MR. KERN: Would there be any objection to CCing those agencies?

MR. O'HARA: Could you repeat your suggestion?

MR. DOWNING: Actually it was not mine. But anyway, Tom and I were discussing it, and he suggested -- which I think is a good idea -- to consider adding at least as a CC to the letter, the Park Service and the California

DTSC, although they were also participants in the meeting. Otherwise they wouldn't formally be receiving a copy of the letter we are sending.

MR. O'HARA: I think that the Board, the Restoration Advisory Board, has a constituency, and we are representing our constituency, and making the statement to

43

♀
†

the Trust based on conclusions that we have drawn. I don't feel -- that is, me personally -- that it is necessary to copy the regulators on this. It is a communication between the Restoration Advisory Board that has its own constituency to the Trust.

MR. BOGGS: To add my two bits as a regulator, throughout this FS process where we are selecting alternatives to these sites, we have been talking alternatives without talking the process of getting to that selected alternative. We have been jumping the gun a little bit. There are five areas I have to look at in approving an alternative or approving a remedy before one of those will be accepted.

So, when I have the letter documenting your concerns on remediation of a site, that goes into our evaluation of the community acceptance. So I don't think it needs to be addressed to DTSC or the regulatory agencies, but for us to be CCed on it is a good idea. It will help in part as a directive to document for regulatory purposes what the community processes are.

MR. O'HARA: I withdraw my objection.

MR. KERN: Are there any other comments on CCing

the letter? Very well, we will carry that out.

Let's move on with the agenda, Item Number 6. That would be Regulatory Agency Status Updates/Input.

44

♀

MR. BOGGS: I will make it quick. Jim and I have been attending all the weekly meetings with most of you. Also regularly on those dates we have been visiting the Presidio and visiting numerous sites and walking them in detail. Pursuant to these meetings DTSC has raised some concerns and actually day after tomorrow I will be meeting with upper management from Sacramento to discuss some of the issues specific to the Presidio here.

Just for your information, what those issues will be is -- a contingency plan was released. We have some concerns with that, just the scope of that, and this will hopefully be resolved. There have been meetings on background metals and how those concentrations were derived. And there are a few issues that have been brought up at that, but that will hopefully get resolved tomorrow. We think we are well on the way of getting that resolved. Also there is some concern over how do we proceed with the restoration here at the Presidio, given that there are six sites that the RAB is concerned with as well as the regulatory agencies who had some concerns.

And we have some concerns with some of the same sites as well. Specifically on Baker Beach/Disturbed Area 3 and Fill Site 6, the agencies are going to be requesting some additional work. If any of the community members have any issues they would like addressed or concerns that they

45

♀

would like answers from DTSC management on, please forward them to me. And that is basically the status.

MR. KERN: Thank you, Bob. Any other questions for Bob at this point? Thank you.

Agenda Item Number 7A -- Project Status Update
(Petroleum Program/Crissy Field.

MR. FORD: We will use slides, I guess, and I will try to keep it short. For the Commissary we are in the process of awarding the contract to the low bidder. We received three bids in late November, and we are still doing the details of the bid evaluations, but the low bidder was about \$450,000 to do the work, which is roughly what we expected it to cost. And we hope to make an award shortly, and I will begin the initial fieldwork later on this month. And it will take somewhere between six weeks and a couple of months to complete it mostly because we split the work into two phases so we could maintain traffic flow on either side of Mason Street or by having a detour during the entire project.

So we will be very busy down there in February and March. So look for us. We are taking off with the Building 1065 and 207/231 cap updates. Harding Lawson has been authorized to start compiling field data and to review the stuff that the Army put together for both of these sites.

46

♀

Our schedule is to update the Building 1065 Corrective

Action Plan the first half of 2001. The 207/231 Corrective Action Plan will be followed along a little more slowly because we think that site is a little more complicated and because it involves -- it is located right adjacent to the Tennessee Hollow restoration area. And it also hinges on Doyle Drive. We think it will take a while to finalize those plans. The plan is to perform the 1065 cleanup in the second half of this year. So, in the first half of this year you can expect to see documents coming down the pike that we will be asking you to review and we will ask you to give us your opinions on them about what we should do and how we should conduct the cleanup at Building 1065.

We are also putting together a list of mini-cap sites to get started on in the first quarter of 2001. For those of you who may not have been here long enough to know the jargon, the mini-cap sites are sites where the Army, for instance, removed some of the fuel distribution system or a tank, and they didn't do it all. They left materials in the ground that exceeded cleanup levels for soil and groundwater by quite a bit. They pulled the tank out and dug to a certain dimension and closed it back up.

The Trust had been going through all those and trying to make a determination about whether we need to go in and dig some more, or whether it is okay the way it is, or just

how to handle it. So there are quite a few of those, and we are going to be starting the first batch this quarter.

The skeet range -- The plan continues. We are trying to get the skeet investigation reports finalized. It is quite close to being final, so the final draft will be out

soon. We can circulate it for everyone to review. The Trust is also discussing doing the cleanup of the skeet range area in-house, using the Trust crews. It looks like this might be a pretty good project for us to do in-house. We can save some time and some money by performing it in-house. We don't have to write a detailed set of plans and specifications, and go out to bid it, which it turns out going through a federal agency is a fairly lengthy process. Anyhow, there will be more news on that in the next month or so.

The other thing I am working on is the closure sampling. We are trying to button up the Crissy Field issues. And the two big ones right now are closure sampling of Fill Site 7 and the installation of monitoring wells in the Building 900's area. We have a draft closure plan that is almost ready to be circulated for review. And we expect to send that around for people to look at around the middle part of this month. And that is what I have been doing. So Chris will take it from here.

MR. BOGGS: The skeet range investigation reports,

48

♀

any idea when that is going to come out?

MR. FORD: I haven't been very good at predicting when that is going to come out, but it should be within the next week since I just delivered what I believe to be the final Trust and Park Service comments to the consultant. So that should be out shortly.

MR. BERMAN: Has there been any fluctuation in the movement of water into the Estuary from the movement of the

from the underground?

MR. FORD: From the Commissary we actually just got a recent round of seep samples that were lower than before. You may recall that the gasoline concentrations in the groundwater as sampled on the marsh bank had stabilized at a little bit less than a half a part per million. As I recall it was a half a part per million. The last round of samples we took had nondetectable gasoline and diesel. So, we are not quite sure what that means. I mean, typically to have the concentration drop is always good news, but, you know, I think we have to keep sampling it and see whether the concentrations continue at that low level. It is possible that they could come back up.

MR. BERMAN: Is there any reason to stall on the remediation effort if, in fact, you continue to sample and you don't find anything?

MR. FORD: I would say in this case, no, just

49

♀

because if we do have, say, a sudden series of non-detect events in the seeps, it is most likely because it has been a fairly dry year and the groundwater at the site has dropped low enough. It is now just flowing under this big layer of gasoline and diesel that we have. And really what I would expect is even if it stays low for a while, if what has happened is that the groundwater level has dropped below the contamination zone, it will come back up once it starts raining either this winter, or if it doesn't rain this winter at some future winter the groundwater level will come back up. It will presumably come into contact with the contamination and start bleeding it into the marsh

bank again.

And the other thing is we have some fairly high concentrations beneath Mason Street, you know, of 15 to 20 thousand parts per million gasoline and diesel. There is some discussion about how you draw the boundary of the saltwater protection zone around the marsh. But almost no matter how you draw it, the contamination is beneath Mason Street and is inside the saltwater protection zone. So, I guess, that is a long answer to say I think we still should dig it out.

MR. NELSON: Moving on with Presidio-wide cleanup and CERCLA. There were a couple of major holidays in between the last RAB meetings. However, we did make

50

♀

progress, and there are some things to report on. Mainly Chapters 1 through 4 and 8 through 12, the meat of the FS have not been issued. We have met with our consultant and the Park Service and the Trust has submitted our comments on the internal draft. And at this point the issuance of the document to the stakeholders for the draft review is pending a lot of what we have been discussing tonight, including the issue of additional data that has been brought up by the agencies, and some other concerns brought up by the community RAB members this evening, which the Trust Board will be briefed on.

So until we get some resolution and some answers on that we are not going to issue a document. We are going to leave it until we get those.

MR. BERMAN: Excuse me. What data is being

1-09-01.txt
collected that you are referring to?

MR. NELSON: I am going to get to that in a second. The field sampling effort that occurred this summer -- there was a sampling plan that was approved by DTSC and the stakeholders in July, and we went out in the field and collected data. And to date we have not received any comments on that. So we still await comments from the stakeholders on that.

Subsequent to that event and release of that document there have been some additional discussions among the

51

♀

agencies in particular and the RAB regarding some sites where the agencies in particular don't feel they can make a decision about which remedy is appropriate unless some additional data is collected. I believe Bob mentioned Fill Site 6 and Baker Beach/Disturbed Area 3 earlier as two of those sites. Just going through these briefly, Landfill E, Battery Howe Wagner and Fill Site 5 were also discussed.

I should tell you specifically which media are planned for collection. Another is Fill Site 6. The area -- if you can picture the tail of the kangaroo, there is a mound of dirt between Halleck and Gerard Streets that remains rather undercharacterized. There was a well that was drilled there this summer. The concentrations and contaminants are below levels of concern, however.

The agencies have indicated they can't buy off on a remedy for that area unless further characterization is done. So there is a plan in place, which will be intended to circulate among all of the stakeholders to do some trenching in that area to take a look at what is in the

trenches, characterize the soil, and make a decision based on that.

Baker Beach/Disturbed Area 3 -- There is some concern regarding the quality of the groundwater that is flowing beneath this area and that perhaps it is flowing through the waste material at the site. This plan is to collect

52

♀
†

additional samples from the seep at the top of the site. There has been some discussion about potentially taking some additional soil samples. We need to discuss that issue further with the agencies and the other stakeholders.

Landfill E -- There was some concern about the seeps that emanate from the top of the landfill, and we wanted also to take a look at the first groundwater layer and groundwater well 07. So, the Park Service and the Trust staff recently went out and identified the location of those seeps where the samples can be collected once the water begins poking out of that.

MR. KERN: For Landfill E, I did visit with Jennifer, yes.

MR. NELSON: So there was RAB input on that process as well. Battery Howe Wagner -- There was some concern regarding taking some more recent data from the older wells and also taking initial rounds of samples from the new wells we put in this summer. We collected groundwater data at this site and did a more careful analysis of the groundwater-flow rate.

And lastly, with Fill Site 5 we intend to collect some additional groundwater to see if there are any impacts from

that site. What we are planning to do with this investigation is submit a letter of the Field Sampling Plan to DTSC and all stakeholders, and then move forward as

53

♀

quickly as possible once it is approved, so that that data can be incorporated into the pending Feasibility Study. It may or may not help people make some additional decisions about remedies for the sites.

We have one last meeting that is still pending. We have received what I hope is the final version of the ARARs section of the reports from our attorneys and our consultants. The Trust attorneys had some in-house comments they submitted. We will be getting that to NPS for their review, so we can submit it to the other stakeholders. And then we will have a meeting to talk about those particular ARARs and which ones are appropriate.

Are there any comments on the Feasibility Study or any questions before I move on?

MR. BERMAN: Just a minor question, in the Fill Site 6 sampling is it only going to be soil sampling or will it be groundwater also?

MR. NELSON: There are actually a number of wells. I apologize for not making that clearer. There are a number of wells that are in alignment with that mound, and I believe there was some intention to take additional samples to see whether or not the conditions are consistent since the summer.

On the groundwater monitoring program I understand we

54

♀

will be receiving the revised Health and Safety Plan and Field Sampling Plan with the Trust and NPS comments incorporated into it next week. Once we get the comments from our staff and NPS it is okay to lease it. We will give it to the agencies, we think, hopefully within this calendar month, and then hopefully get into the field in February. We will be moving fairly expeditiously in getting into the field once the plan has been approved.

On Mountain Lake we just received the field sampling plan with all the stakeholders' revisions and comments incorporated into it this evening. They arrived before we were coming over here. We wanted to take a look at it and make sure it meets our requirements before sending it out. Sampling at the site will occur when the contractor has the boats available. Along the lines of the activities out there, there will be quite a bit of notification from friends of Mountain Lake, SF City Parks Department, Golden Gate, the advisory committee. There will be a range out there to answer questions. And also there will be signs posted about activities that will be going on during the sampling.

And lastly we have the community relations update. We have submitted the Community Relations Plan to EKI. They are revising it and I understand we should probably be getting something out to the stakeholders the middle to the

55

♀

end of this month based on those minimal comments.

Of course, we all met Jane Packer, our new community relations specialist. We are very happy to have her on board. We are excited for you all to get to know her and teach her all about the inner workings of the Presidio meetings program.

And last, but not least our bimonthly meeting -- I believe this is currently also a quarterly meeting with DTSC and other stakeholders -- will be next Tuesday at 1:00 p.m. in the conference room. That is all I have unless there are any questions.

MR. KERN: I have a question. There was a meeting today that I wasn't able to attend.

MR. NELSON: Today we had a follow-up meeting.

MS. REACKHOF: I know you mentioned briefly that we did have a meeting, and we do have some follow-up meetings that are going to happen with that. So it wasn't a clear resolution.

MR. BOGGS: I can provide a brief update. Basically, subsequent to the meeting that we did attend I did some follow-up at the agency, and there is a general consensus regarding the way that groundwater and metals are calculated. Basically, I outlined the approach that DTSC would like to approach in evaluating background metals specifically. The biggest concern was there were seven

metals that the Trust was using regional or worldwide crest numbers or averages for because the data that was collected, most of it was below the protection limit.

Specifically how the department wants that handled is those nontechnical data, rather than exclude it from the

data set, they should use half that number. So pursuant to the meeting I am drafting a letter basically saying we would like to have the numbers calculated in that way and proceed from there.

MS. REACKHOF: Subject to follow-up meetings.

MR. NELSON: We are going to summarize the issue.

MR. BERMAN: Is there a document that describes the general groundwater monitoring program that is something that describes the plans for doing all that throughout the Presidio?

MR. NELSON: That is the sampling plan. The sampling plan that we intend to release in the next week or so is that document. And what we have done is built upon and hopefully improved and streamlined the Army program, which was somewhat cumbersome and hard to follow. So we hope we simplified it so we can do it cheaper and more efficiently. So that plan should be coming out and we can give you a copy.

MR. BERMAN: Over what time span is that the consideration for?

57

♀

MR. NELSON: You mean when would you expect to see the document?

MR. BERMAN: No, in the groundwater monitoring, over what time span is the plan to do that? Is it over a year, two years, a 20-year time span?

MR. NELSON: It is dependent upon some of the decisions that come out of the Feasibility Study in terms of how much monitoring is going to be required. Some of

the sites are petroleum programs, so there is monitoring that is left on us with a clock that is ticking. Some of the sites still need further characterization. So that monitoring will be helpful in answering some of those questions. And then there are some sites where we continue to do the monitoring per agreement. After a number of years we may go back and take a look to see if the monitoring is necessary to continue on. It varies on a site-by-site basis. There is no uniform standard.

MR. BERMAN: I appreciate that, but you are looking over the general set of problems, those that have to be settled immediately as well as those that might have to continue to a longer term. So all of that is included in that document?

MR. NELSON: Would you say that? I don't think so. As that document is completed and as other decision documents are completed for some of these petroleum sites,

58

♀

those answers will be there for you to look at. But certainly, I think all of the groundwater data that is selected and will be collected will be helpful in making those decisions.

MR. ULLENSVANG: The actual plan will talk about that and sort of self-describe what it covers. And it generally is looking about a one-year horizon because of the contracts, but it will talk about how it will lengthen it as well so you wouldn't have to redo the plan. But it doesn't go out to the types like Chris is talking about for five or ten years. It will be more immediate with some understanding of how it will change in time as

understanding the sites needs.

MR. BERMAN: So is there some thought about sort of a unsteady groundwater monitoring program that will even actually be done?

MR. ULLENSVANG: That may be done in a number of forms. Chris was talking about the needs of individual sites. This is looking more at the field collection program, which is fairly static in techniques. I mean, collecting the sample is pretty static. You do it the same way each time. The analytics you choose to look for might change and there will be provisions for change in that as knowledge needs change. But the plan doesn't talk about the evaluations or thought process, which need to go along

59

♀

a separate track, looking forward, and looking at the plan, which I think is what you are trying to get at.

And this plan is just looking at the field. It is a field collection effort. So it is a valid question, but not with respect to the collection plan.

MR. NELSON: I remember that the Army plan actually contained a section that had sort of a decision tree you would follow or take sites out. And this plan doesn't include that. I think what we would like to do is what I said earlier, address sites individually as particular decision documents come out. And we need to deal with them that way so we have more specific information about them, the period of monitoring, how much monitoring may be credited towards a site, et cetera. If there is a static level of contamination, that should be

taken into consideration for future monitoring.

MR. BERMAN: So is there a plan to develop a document which really looks at the long-term groundwater monitoring requirements?

MR. NELSON: I think it will be done on a site-specific basis. That is how we hope to do it. There has already been a lot of monitoring done. We don't want to be redundant. We can certainly, from that, take these sites in order to save money and commit those funds to something more important.

60

♀

MR. KERN: Any further questions for Chris? Chris, thanks, and Bob, thanks for the update. Anything else? Item 8 -- any new business? Any new items to bring to our attention? I see none.

MR. BERMAN: Well, there is sort of a new item that was mentioned by Tom, which was that even -- actually he thought -- I did hear you say that there would be a opportunity for the Trust Board to participate in one of our meetings. And the question was as to whether the community members wanted to prepare something specific with that in mind.

MR. KERN: Would it be appropriate, then, at a committee meeting perhaps to develop some informal discussion about how such a meeting might happen, or how the Board would like to present something, or should we be prepared to present something?

MR. NELSON: I would envision if we have information by the time of the committee meeting this month regarding the participation of a board member or several

1-09-01.txt

board members of the RAB meetings, we will share them at that time. We may not have the information at that time. I don't know what the time table is.

I have one small item. I am going to be taking a month off starting next week. So I will be coming back right after President's Day. So any business regarding the RAB,

61

♀
†

Presidio-wide cleanup, or CERCLA should be directed to Sharron or Jane.

MR. KERN: Have a good trip. Okay. So we should carry that item with the community members to our next committee meeting agenda. That sort of hits on Item Number 10 -- committee meeting agendas. So are there any other items people feel like we need to get on the agenda at this point? Please go through Mark and Jane to get your items on the appropriate agendas. Are there any other announcements or comments this evening?

I definitely want to thank everyone for your close participation and civil approach. We always appreciate that. So, then, without objection the meeting is adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.)

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Jerry Anderson

Sam Berman

Bob Boggs, EKI

Edward Callahan

Julie Cheever

Dennis Downing

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Matt Fottler

Julian Hultgren

Doug Kern

Tom Kingston

Jan Monaghan

Scott Miller

Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

Peter O'Hara

Jane Packard, Presidio Trust

Sharron Reackhof, Presidio Trust

Patricia Ryan

Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

Tracy Wright

Gloria Yaros

Mark Youngkin

♀

1-09-01. txt

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB -- PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

7:14 p.m.

MR. KERN: Good evening everyone and welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. I would like to welcome everyone here tonight: members of the Presidio Trust staff, other contractors, National Park Service representatives, members of the regulatory community, of course, our community members of the board, and particularly any folks out in the audience who are members of the general public. We welcome you tonight.

I would like to see that everyone has an agenda, and the agenda has been changing over the last week, even as late as today, so you might notice a few changes. Are there any additional changes from what you see printed that anyone would like to make?

Okay. I see none. We will move ahead. Any announcements tonight? Old business? Any new business? Okay. Committee reports.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Good evening. We had our regular monthly committee meeting on January 23rd, and this was just kind of an all-around miscellaneous topics meeting. We talked about the Community Relations Plan, membership issues, sending out termination letters and recruiting new members. We discussed some cost data that was brought in on an Excel

spreadsheet where we looked at cost data. And we scheduled-a working group meeting on Landfill E, which occurred on February 6.

We had a good meeting. We went through all the data and historical information on Landfill E, and had just an informal group discussion about the problems and proposed alternative remedies. I am sure you will be hearing more about that in the upcoming meetings. And we also decided to send out a termination letter. I think Jan will give us a report on membership.

MS. MONAGHAN: We are sending out a termination letter to Arlene Gemmill, whose leave of absence expired in October. We also will send a letter to Kathryn Hyde. And also Julian has offered to redo the membership applications. We are looking to do another round of membership.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. And our next committee meeting is scheduled for the fourth Tuesday of February. So I hope you all can make it. We will send out an agenda as soon as we decide what we will talk about.

MR. KERN: Thanks, Mark. Any questions for Mark? Very good.

Our next item is RAB Acknowledgement. We have a very special guest with us this evening. Mary Murphy is a director of the Presidio Trust Board and is one of the directors. And she has been involved for a long time as a person on the clean up of the Presidio. She has played a key role in negotiating with the Army folks back in Washington DC, and was also instrumental in getting a really spectacular deal for the Presidio in terms of money and also in terms of getting the Presidio Trust the ability to take control of the cleanup to do it faster,

better, cheaper, and all of that. So it is quite a privilege and an honor to be able to introduce her tonight. I would like to welcome her to our board meeting.

Mary has just a few comments, I think, tonight about the program and she will entertain a few questions afterwards. Welcome.

MS. MURPHY: Thank you for having me here this evening. I am mostly here, basically, to say thank you for all the work that you have done. I see you here in the evening, taking time from when you could be at home with your families or cooking dinner. I know how hard it is to make this kind of a commitment to a process that can be as long as this. I feel like Doug and Brian and I have been through this from the very beginning. You were on before me, Doug.

When I was first appointed to the Presidio Trust Board -- which was almost four years ago now -- the remediation process was ongoing, and the Army had just proposed their remedial action plan, and we jumped in. We didn't have an executive director. We didn't have anybody really. We just had the board, and we decided that our first order of business would be to address the environmental remediation. So, doing what we knew how to do best, we hired consultants and we had EKI jump in.

And that was the beginning of the process in which we went to the Pentagon to talk about starting the transaction, that leads us here today, to transfer the lead authority to the Trust. One of the things that certainly motivated me in urging the rest of the board to take the step, which I think all of

us understood had some real had measure of risk for us, was because at that point it was about nine years that the Army had been doing their remedial investigation, and I personally felt it was moving at a glacial pace. And that was something we couldn't tolerate. We simply could not put off environmental remediation and put it on such a slow track.

And certainly the plan that the Army had proposed was a track that was far to slow and far less ambitious than any of us on the Trust wished to see. That was the genesis of going to the Army and doing the Memorandum of Agreement that lead us to the hundred million dollar contract, if you will, and the solutions we have generated.

One of the things that I think we were a little concerned about -- I know I was -- in taking over a lead agency authority was, you know, it is easy to stand on the sidelines and say, "I can do that faster and better and cheaper, " and somebody says, "Okay big shot. Here is the dough. Make it happen. " And you realize it is a very daunting task. We especially felt having spent a year of our life negotiating the deal, I was committed to the process.

At that point it was one of the those moments when we were ready to close it out -- and I hardly ever had a sleepless night at all except for my kids waking me up to get fed as babies -- but I kept thinking, "What if things don't work out? " Things at work don't usually keep me up, but I was up worrying a little bit, and thinking, "I hope we are doing right. " This is a daunting task to become the lead agency and to have to bring together all the district groups and

regulatory agencies and sort of all the stakeholders in the remediation process to try to reach agreement on such complicated matters.

And I have got to tell you I am so grateful to the community and to the regulatory agencies and to this board for all the work they have put in because, knock on wood, this is the way it is supposed to happen. I know there are a couple of sites that are still open and still are a subject of discussion, and perhaps we will discuss them further tonight, but to me it is incredibly heartening to see that we have been able -- we have -- all reasonable people can disagree and certainly unreasonable people use that to constantly disagree, but even with all of the possible remedies that each site could offer, the fact that we have been able to reach agreement amongst so many stakeholders on so many sites in such an expeditious manner is due to the hard work of you.

On behalf of the board and on a personal level you have made this a success and I just really want to say thank you.

MR. KERN: Thank you very much. Do any of you have any questions or comments. We have a neat opportunity have a to have a little dialogue if anyone has any thoughts. I know this group will always have something. I can always look to Sam to pry a question out of him. Anyone have any questions.

MS. MURPHY: I would add one thing that may provoke discussion. I think one of the big challenges to us in terms of negotiating with the Army for

the amount of money -- we seemed pretty far apart, really far apart when we first started. If I recall correctly, I think their original plan was to spend about six million dollars. It was significantly less than one hundred million over a 30-year period.

One of the risks we certainly ran was we had a lot of scientific data available to us, but we needed to come up with some sort of shadow remediation plan, obviously, and cost that out to try to have a basis for negotiating with the Army for the amount of money we could actually get, and then to insure over and above that piece of the puzzle to make all of the federal agencies who are parties to the agreement feel comfortable. But it puts us in a situation where we had to have some measure of comfort that we were right, and what we were proposing was sufficiently conservative, I think, in every sense of that word, to gain acceptance with the community, to gain acceptance with the regulatory agencies to really feel as if we were doing the right thing by the Presidio.

And I think the good news is that we have been able to reach agreement on a lot of sites, and it looks like we are within the constraints primarily of the money we have projected for this. That is the good news about it. The bad news is that we sort of did cast our die to some degree when we did that agreement. We couldn't have the sky as the limit because the agreement was not premised on if sky is the limit. It was a compromise to get the money early on in the process and have it in hand.

That was a risk we felt we were running. With funds in appropriations declining to the remediation office within the Army they were facing declining funds and there were a lot of demands on those funds. One of the challenges we face as a board is we really do have a limited pie, and we have to slice it up among these different sites. And we hope at the end of the day the cost will come in lower than we projected, but my experience in the construction industry over this last year is that construction costs have increased 15 percent over this last year. So based on that you want to have a relatively big contingency.

If anything, they are projecting -- I have only seen costs go up, not down, but it does constrain us. We can't pay for everything. We have to figure out what really needs the most attention, and where will we get the most for our money in terms of remediation.

MR. MILLER: I guess this may be something we will address later or some other time, but there is this one issue of certain developments around certain habitat areas and some landfill areas. There were a couple of sites that are open, but are in question, and I was wondering -- I know there is an insurance program in place where if the cost of clean up exceeds a certain amount it triggers protection to be capped. And I don't know if those requirements restrict the options of what we are able to do in terms of looking at a range of alternatives for particular landfill area.

MS. MURPHY: I actually don't know the answer to that without --

MS. REACKHOF: I think one of the things to take into consideration

is that the insurance policy was primarily identified to be used if the site was larger than we thought, or a new site came about which the Army would reimburse us for. It wasn't really for trying to pay for a Cadillac remediation when we had, through the negotiations, worked for a different type of response at the site, i.e. Landfill E. If we now go back and say that we are going to remove Landfill E at a cost of 10 or 11 million dollars -- the insurance policy wasn't identified to kick in to pay because we decided at this point to do a different remediation than what we had Memorandums of Agreement for.

MS. MURPHY: How much flexibility technically was in that, you know, I don't know. I mean, there has got to be some measure of funds available, but it was premised on certain assumptions. I know Landfill E is one of the sites still open. And I feel it is really particularly one to be concerned about because actually Landfill E was my one of my strutting horses because it is such a large landfill, and so expensive to excavate, and also historically has been culturally landscaped as a ball field. It naturally invites active recreation in all sorts of recreation. As a park member and user I am in support of that.

And so to me, one of the things about Landfill E that I liked that was sort of a prime example in the negotiations that I felt strongly about is if you maintain the cultural landscape and the uses, you want to pay some respect to the uses that the Army actually made of the open spaces themselves. And it is kind of a natural site to reuse it as a ball field rather than residential. That was a real fight with the Army because when they originally were doing Landfill E, even

though a little bit is adjacent to the residential, they basically don't let any humans near it. Wait a minute. You are right. One of the residential units is a little bit over Landfill E, so it is -- in fact, it is residential in nature as it is. And we really beat them up about that. We said, "We are not looking to necessarily excavate something as large as this. We don't view that as in a cost-effective, but we do think that a really effective cap for it is to be reused as a ball field within sort of its traditional use. That would be the way to go. "

So, I know that is still open and -- I mean, obviously if the sky were the limit, if we didn't have financial constraints, we would have a different point of view about it. You may want to consider doing something else altogether that would invite a different set of uses for the site than the default use we have come to, which is to use it as a ball field again. But at that point you have to balance.

There are competing remedies. One is excavate something and bring in new clean fill. It pushes you to use it for a different use than the ball field as well. MR. BERMAN: Of course we all are thanking you for your efforts to accomplish the amount of the funds that you did, but it is quite possible that the situation would arise where the funds are sort of at the limit, and maybe a slightly better job could be done for a little bit more. What is your view about the possibility of getting either public additional -- either public or private funds in the order of say 10 to 15 percent of the amount granted if we reach a point where there is a real step in the quality of the remediation that would require a small amount over the amount that has been allotted?

MS. MURPHY: I have to say I think it is very slim to none, and I will tell you why. Because, first of all, every time I interact with the Pentagon they never fail to note how much criticism is leveled at them for having given us so much money. Sort of the word in the Pentagon is that, you know, we took their pants off or something like that, and they feel we are very clean as it goes. They are closing bases and have closed bases where the remediation is far more serious and some are in this immediate area. And there is a very legitimate discussion to be had about environmental justice, and I don't know that the political climate would support additional funds to this particular site. We are certainly not going to get additional funds from the Army unless it is something that is unknown or an unidentified contaminant in which, under the MOA, they are still responsible under the law and the MOA. But I think it would be highly unlikely for them to give any more.

Sort of what I know -- and I certainly invite anybody else if they have a contrary opinion -- I don't think we will ever get another public penny from the Army, for example, or from another remediation because I think there are pressing needs for remediation at other closed bases. So then the question becomes whether or not there are ways that we, within our budgetary constraints, can find ways to do additional remediation.

In that regard I would like to say as another capital issue, we have a huge capital budget and a huge number of capital costs. And, you know, the question always comes with regard to priorities. Your capital costs, public

health, and human safety are the top priority. The first dollar out -- in my view and I don't think anybody else would disagree -- I don't think that is what we are talking about. I don't think in any way even working -- even if we came in under one hundred million dollars, I don't think anybody I know that would in any way compromise public health or human safety, and there never should be.

But leaving that aside, achieving another end alternative at some point just becomes what we can achieve. We will have additional needs that I view in the remediation category, which can also be a capital need; for example, lead-based paint and asbestos. We will have needs on buildings and around buildings in the soils that are not addressed by the hundred million dollars that we are going to have to find ways to pay for.

So, I think to that extent we will pay for those things, but it gets into what would be into a capital budget issue. I think the answer is there will not be additional public funds allocated to this park for this purpose, but if we could fund the money in other ways that is clearly one of the things we will do.

One of the things we do to address these issues is trying to find capital funding sources either from us or from tenants who address these things. That means it comes out of a revenue stream. It is all out of our budget eventually. There are ways to do that.

MR. HULTGREN: Apparently it is difficult getting money after the fund -- after remediations have been finished. In the unlikely event there is money left over what would happen to the money remaining in that fund?

MS. MURPHY: My sense is that -- I don't mean to be -- you know, the funds really do not cover the full cost by any stretch of the imagination of lead-based paint and asbestos remediation. And I think everyone who is a lawyer in the room can understand why that would be the case. I mean, why the compromise was struck at that point, I defer to the environmental lawyers on the board, you know. I think that the clarity of legal liability for those items is not wholly clear. And so we certainly could use every additional penny we have to deal with those issues.

The question becomes -- prioritizing that will be a demand on those funds, as will any sort of other remediation that we think might be better than what we are proposing here, or God forbid we have a remedy that proves not to be as effective as we would have liked. And obviously, again, there is a priority issue. There are certainly things that we feel very strongly about that we can't compromise on. If it looks like something isn't working, that would be the first dollar out.

Again, I kind of think of our capital needs as endless. It is like putting out smoked salmon at a party. Everything will be eaten, no matter how much you put out. We will spend every dollar we can get our hands on to improve this place. It depends which is the most pressing need.

MR. KERN: I think one of the things that we are beginning to talk about in terms of Landfill E is perhaps what are the reasons that the cost appears to be higher than the current estimate. So we are working with that.

We are trying to look at real market rates for transportation disposal costs, and we are working with staff to try to look at ways to reduce the risks that it could be a lot more expensive than is predicted.

So we wouldn't just go at excavation without additional knowledge and things. So that is part of what our ongoing discussions are about, and we hope to keep that going for a while. Other ideas? Very good. Well, thank you so much for coming.

MS. MURPHY: Thank you very much. And, again, I just want to thank you. I have certainly spent a lot of my time on pro bono projects, much to the chagrin of my law partners. But I can't tell you how much of a difference it is that you do that. And I really am sincerely grateful for your efforts and grateful for the spirit in which you approach the issues.

I think everybody understands that it is really tough to make these decisions and sometimes you have to make compromises among the choices, but at the end of the day I feel really proud about the fact that we have the funds available, and this base will be cleaner much earlier in the process than any other base in the country. That is a huge success story. And as I said, you have made that possible by your contributions here and by being so supportive of this process and caring so much about it. So, again, I want to say thank you for everything you have done.

(Applause)

MR. KERN: We are ready to move on now to item number 6, and

that would be George and the petroleum and Crissy Field projects.

MR. FORD: If the slides won't come up the bad news is that will take longer because I will think of more things to say. Okay. We will go through the petroleum program and the Commissary cleanup. The contract has been awarded. It was awarded to Performance Excavators of San Rafael. They will do about half of the work and Giovatti Brothers from Crissy Field restoration fame will be doing about half of the work. They will do all the paving, and I have mixed feelings about that, but, hey, they were the low bid, so we are going to go with it.

The kick-off meeting for the job is tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. Anybody who wants to come is invited. We should be getting a schedule from the contractor. We expect them to propose breaking ground sometime within the next week to 10 days. And the job should take roughly two months to complete. So our plan is to get it done and get out of there well ahead of the Crissy Field opening in the beginning of the last week of April.

For the 1065 and 270/231 Corrective Action Plan, Harding/Lawson is continuing to work on the 1065 cap update. We expect a task list from them momentarily, and that will sort of help us lay out the steps that we need to go through to get to a final cap so that we can do the actual cleanup either later this year or early next year depending on when it fits best into the schedule.

They are also doing the 207/231 cap update. So they will be developing a task list to finalize that cap. We expect that one is going to take longer

because Doyle Drive goes right through the middle of the site, and it also straddles the Tennessee Hollow rip rap corridor. We think it may take more discussion to get to the final cap.

There more mini-cap sites and tank closures. We have a list we are still working on internally. We keep adding things to the list. The most recent addition was interim leasing sites that the Trust is looking at. They keep looking ahead and looking at new buildings to put in the interim leasing program. If there are any tank issues they go to the front so we can clean them up before they go off the lease.

MR. KERN: How many are labeled top priority now? MR. FORD:

Right now there are 12 that I am aware of, although a number of them fall into a gray area where it is not exactly clear what has to be done. Some of them, a paper study will close it out, and other ones will be significantly more than a paper study where we will actually have to go out and finish the cleanup that was started.

There are at least a dozen of them, but I can't tell you which of those 12 will require physical action. We hope to identify that pretty soon.

Crissy Field closure draft work plan should be coming out the week of the 18th of February. We have actually been through a few alterations of the plan inhouse, and we think it is finally getting good enough to see the light of day.

You will see that shortly, and the thinking right now -- I may have mentioned

this last month. We are looking very seriously at having the Trust perform the cleanup as away to speed it up and to also kind of cut our teeth on some cleanup work. It saves money primarily in this case because we don't have to draw a detailed plan and specs and go through a bidding process. We can just take the work plan and go out there with our own crew and do what the approved work plan says and cut out the contracting cycle, which in the case of the Trust takes some time.

We have the greatest contract specialist in the world who is sitting right here. His name is Albert Chan and he can work some magic with the federal contracting process, but he is only able to turn the federal government on a dime.

MR. KERN: He would be a very valuable person if he could do that.

MR. FORD: He is very valuable and we don't let him come out at night very often because we don't want him to get in trouble or get lost. He is too valuable in the daytime, but, you know, the contracting cycle is one of the things that we look at. You can compress it, but you can't eliminate it. So by doing some of the cleanup jobs inhouse, you know, it will save us time. And usually when we are saving time we are saving money.

The Crissy Field closure sampling. We are finishing up a draft closure plan. We expect to send that out the week of the 18th. You all will get to see that and can comment on that. We hope when it becomes final it will be the

document that allows us to close out Crissy Field once and for all, so then it can be monitored long term and go off of everybody's radar screen.

We have one other item, which -- this is sort of a new item that I would like to introduce. Some Trust staff and Park Service staff have been working on this for a little while. This may be the first time you hear about it. The Trust and Park Service are both kind of anxious to get going and move dirt and actually restore sites. And one of the sites that we have jointly identified as being a good candidate to move up to the top of the pile for a restoration is Graded Area 9. And most of you probably know where that is. If you don't, it is on the west side of Weedmeyer Road. It is behind the Public Service Health Hospital on the opposite side of Weedmeyer Road, sort of between the top of the Baker Beach Apartments and Weedmeyer Road. It looks like a big mud hole on one end of it where people cut through.

The Trust and the Park Service have agreed that we think the long-term use of that site is probably as a dune restoration site. There are a bunch of factors working right now that cause us to kind of want to bring it forward in the remedial process and get started on the restoration quite soon, meaning just about as soon as possible.

A couple of these factors that are working to push the project along are we may have some dune sand available to us in Golden Gate Park that we can get simply for the cost of hauling. That is not a done deal yet, but it is one of these things that if we could get the sand at low cost, we will take it. If we can't, we

will find other sources. The Park Service also has -- I don't know what the term is -- quite a few native plants that are suitable for a dune restoration that are in the nursery and ready to go and need to find a home pretty soon.

In order to try to bring this project forward the Trust has already sent a letter requesting concurrence from DTSC. We think this will either be a no-action site or a permeable-cap site. And restoring sand dune on the site is consistent with either remedy. So we have basically requested that DTSC agree in writing that what we are proposing to do is okay or at least not objectionable from their point of view. They have the letter and they are considering it. We hope they will look favorably upon it, but we will wait to hear.

And now I should introduce Tom Eckels, who is with the Park Service. And he is here, and will take a few minutes to fill you in on some of the details on what is proposed for Graded Area 9.

MR. KERN: If I might jump in, I think you may have been introduced to Tom before, but, Tom, if you could just take a second or two and describe what you do and what your responsibilities are, why the heck are you here any way.

MR. ECKLES: I work for the Park Service in the Natural Resources Division, and my primary responsibility is plants and to implement habitat restoration on remediation sites. Of course, not all of them, but a lot of them, Graded Area 9 being one of the them. So that is why you have seen me here at meetings before. I am just here usually to answer questions if they

come up.

Tonight I am here to try to explain what it is that we -- that is the Trust and the Park Service -- would like to do at Graded Area 9. This is an air photo taken recently in March of 2000, showing the main part of Graded Area 9, and another part of the site goes across Weedmeyer Street, and a couple of areas we are calling extensions. What we would like to do for all these sites eventually, but mostly in the very near future on these two sites here, are to restore dune scrub.

And it was once a very widespread community in San Francisco, and it has been reduced to a very small fraction of what it once was by development. We have a few examples of existing dune scrub left in the city near Baker Beach and a little bit at Crissy Field. What we would like to do to accomplish this is to rip the surface of the site just to increase water percolation. Right now it is a very hard path site. We would import dune sand and core the site with anywhere from 2 to 7 feet of dune sand and scrub the sand to resemble natural dunes. Then we would plant native dune scrub plants.

Dune scrub differs from wide coastal scrub that maybe you are familiar with. In the mountain ranges there are certain species of plants that only grow in sand. This site is a missing link -- one of the missing links in the Presidio to recorrect some corridors of dune scrub habitat. The dune scrub habitat is a host to about half a dozen special plant species that range from being rare to endangered. Although we are not going to plant any of those listed species

initially at this site, because this site is partially within the special management zone of the Presidio's Vegetation Management Plan -- and the planning for that hasn't been finished yet -- the ultimate idea is to link Lobos Dunes, which is to the southwest of this site with Presidio Hills and form a corridor for not only the plants, but animals such as the local rare and almost disappearing now California Quail.

I have one other poster board here that shows just conceptually what these dunes would look in topographical form with these shapes here representing one foot contours. So these are not huge dunes. Once the site would be finished, at most they are 5 feet from low point to high point of the dunes. And it would be aligned with prevailing wind direction. And that is it in a nutshell.

MR. KERN: Questions for Tom?

MR. BERMAN: Did you want to talk about the fences?

MR. ECKLES: Thank you. There are two things I should mention. We are proposing to put up a fence, a temporary fence, to protect the site while the new plants become established. This fence would look, hopefully, very similar to the one around the dunes along the promenade at Crissy Field. It would be sort of low profile, but one that would discourage people and their pets from trying to walk across the area in the early stages of recovery.

The other part of this plan is removal of a few trees. These are Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, and blue, gum, trees along the west side of

Weedmeyer Street, and also several on these the east side of Weedmeyer Street. And the reason for removing the trees is because the native plants have a really hard time growing in the shade of these trees. And two these species of trees exude chemicals that prevent native plant species from growing. This is something we would like to do right away. These trees we would like to do as soon as possible. There may be logistical problems that prevent that from happening for a while. The restoration of these sites on the east side of Weedmeyer overall we are probably going to delay so that they occur in conjunction with the restoration of Landfill 8, which is right here.

MR. HULTGREN: Does the area that is more or less downstream from that that has the boardwalkways and plantings, what kind of plantings are those relative to the ones that are going in up here?

MR. ECKLES: Lobos Dunes -- it would be very similar. In fact, it would be pretty much the same thing. The dunes here would be smaller, but the plant palate would be the same because it is the same plant community.

MR. MILLER: First, I want to thank you for this presentation. It is one of the inspiring aspects of this program to see where things are going restoration-wise is very satisfying and exciting.

If you are planning to restore some California Quail, how does that happen? Do you bring existing communities over?

MR. ECKLES: We don't reintroduce the birds, but we provide them with habitat that is more conducive to their survival than what is out here

right now, which are wide open urban areas, especially with cats and other hazards. A dune scrub would be one of the plant communities where they would find a lot of refuge and food, and, hopefully, their numbers would increase because of that.

MS. WRIGHT: I think the largest quail population was in that area.

MR. ECKLES: Yes, they actually spend a lot of time over in the dune scrub over here, and some people have seen some going through this area to get to Lobos Dunes. So to restore this area would be a very critical factor in helping them expand their population.

MS. YAROS: In general are you talking about doing the same kind of plantings you did at Crissy Field?

MR. ECKLES: Not quite because Crissy Field is a little different type of plant for dunes, which is closer to the Bay and so it has more salt in the area in the soil. This would be similar to the Lobos Creek Dunes near Building 1750. I'm sure most of you have been there. There is a boardwalk right through there. It is actually just west of Landfill 10. If you know where Landfill 10 is, it is at the base of that slope and going west is Lobos Dunes.

MS. YAROS: And in general is the Park Service satisfied with what is happening at the Presidio as far as the plants? It seems to me some are thriving, some are not.

MR. ECKLES: I am not directly involved with that project, but my understanding is it is doing very well. And my own casual observation is that it

is doing phenomenally well. I am impressed by how it is coming along. And by the way, Lobos Dunes that I keep mentioning was also a restoration site. That whole area was pretty much bare during reconstruction of the Richmond Sewer Transport Project. So, if you look at that you would also see a successful restoration. It is in its fourth or fifth year now, I think.

MR. BERMAN: Do you want to comment about the long term -- what you think is the long-term use of the area? MR. ECKLES: Well, I will put this board back up because one of the departments here at the Presidio that is involved with planning for the site is the trails department, and they would like to maintain some kind of corridors for both pedestrians and multi-use near the site. Right now, of course, across the northern part of the site there is that huge 4x4 recreation area that people four by through. That is a joke, but it looks like a 4x4 went through it.

It is totally rugged and muddy, but the Trust and the Park Service would like to maintain some kind of an access for future trails for construction across the north part. These green corridors are all potential trail corridors that we are going to leave uncovered with sand, not covered with sand, so it will facilitate any future trail construction possibilities, although this area actually is naturally with sand right now.

So we are not going to do anything with that. We will leave it as a corridor. This yellow corridor -- you might have a hard time seeing -- these two monitoring wells are on this site, and we will leave a very minimal sand cover

here for access to the wells until such time as they, hopefully, will be destroyed in the future. So at some point in the future a drill rig will have to be brought in here to destroy these wells. That is why we are leaving that path here.

It may be possible in the long range future when this is a much more expanded restored habitat to have a boardwalk similar to the one at Lobos Dunes run through the dunes. But at this point to run any trails within this area with this fragmented plan is a little too much. This is only two-and-a-half acres here, and we are trying to restore habitat in decent size chunks so quail and other animals would have a little refuge from humans, given that there is housing here and a busy street here.

MS. POOLE: How do you protect against wind blowing the vegetation away?

MR. ECKLES: We will plant it fairly densely especially along the east side of the site. The way it eventually looks may not quite be like that. As long as the trees are -- I am showing here some kind of a berm along the east side and have the side as sort of a protection against any accidental movement of sand.

I should mention that in nature there are stabilized and moving dunes. And we are not trying to restore moving dunes because that is not feasible in this kind of environment unless, of course, we represent close Weedmeyer out permanently. They will be densely vegetated, and at Lobos Dunes there is very little movement of sand.

MR. MILLER: You mentioned you are going to be restoring the topography or with the dune sand from Golden Gate Park. Do they have excess dune sand there?

MR. ECKLES: They have left over sand from a project that just was completed there, and we are looking for other sources right now of dune sand. It is not that easy to find, so this project may take place in stages. I should back up because I think I missed one thing. The Presidio's Vegetation Management Plan, which is not quite finalized but very close to it, calls for this area to be restored to a native plant community.

So that is one of the reasons we are proposing to do this. The plant community, before the Army tried to build an athletic field, was a dune scrub.

MS. WRIGHT: Back to the quail, and I am sure you have thought about this, you are on a quick time line because of the availability of the sand, but doesn't the quail nesting season start soon? Is there any chance of having nesting habitats in the current area that you know of, and will the restoration be in any way ready by May?

MR. ECKLES: The people that I have consulted on this -- and this has gone through both the Trust and Park Service -- that I have gone through with you already with just a few stipulations is there is no nesting habitat on the main part of the area on-site. However, there are potential nesting sites nearby.

So any construction activities will be undertaken in such ways to minimize disturbance and all the crews will be educated as to the fact that quail do use

the adjacent area and that speed limits on the construction site will be kept down. I don't think it will be hard, but speed limits will be kept down to 5 miles an hour. Construction crews will be instructed to avoid areas where quail may be nesting. We will do that and flag off areas or tape off areas where crews couldn't go.

MS. WRIGHT: I think there is also sand in that area. Are you working with the Trust?

MR. ECKLES: The Trust is working with us, and actually one other thing we are doing is we are going to have a public meetings just for the residents of Baker Beach and the other residents to let them know what is going on in their backyard.

MR. KERN: Any other questions? Thanks a lot.

MR. ECKLES: Thank you for allowing us to present this.

MS. REACKHOF: Thank you. It is nice to know all this hard work everybody is doing has an end in site. So actually in regard to that I wanted to spend a little bit of time just echoing some of the sentiments of what Mary said about how hard everybody has been working. I know a lot of you are very actively involved in going to meetings every week, going to all the sites, painfully going through the data, and working hard as a team with the Trust, the regulatory agencies, and the Park Service.

And I know that it seems like it was a neverending story, but we have 40 sites, 39 of which we have actually come to a -- probably what I would call

agreement on the end remedies, which is really what I am here to present tonight. Before I get into any specifics I wanted to walk through the sites that we have all come to know and love and where we have ended up on them.

Before I get started, I think one thing I want to mention -- as you will notice primarily the remedy that you are going to find that has been looked at as a proposed remedy is excavation of the site, excavation of any hot spots, and no further action because the site is not requiring any further action. We have had all very positive responses to the Presidio remediation program.

So what I have decided to do is walk through each site by planning area and just brief you of where we are at with these sites, and then if you have any questions we can go through them. If you want to stop me as we are going through this to get a location I have asked Doug if he would mind pointing it out on the Presidio map. So also, with that in mind, just a caveat, we are also still discussing the remedies with the regulatory agencies and all the stakeholders.

We still need to get out a draft Feasibility Study, but if we have a wish list it will be an idea of sort of where we are heading.

Main post Building 215 was an excavation of any impacted soil. Sewer Lift Station 2 was no further action. Former Building 609 was excavation of any impacted soil. In the Fort Scott area we had Building 1244, 1245 and 1351 area, which were all excavation of any impacted soils. Building 1369 and 1388 area were no further action sites. Fill Site 6, we are going to be doing some additional characterization tomorrow. Doug might add a little to that when he

has his presentation, but we heard what everybody was saying and we are all going to be out there at 7:30 or 8:00 a.m. doing additional trenching to see what we really have.

Battery Howe Wagner, again, we listened to the stakeholders. The Trust is presently preparing some plans and going through the process and are hoping to get out there quickly to get some trenching at that site. Building 1057 is no further action. Buildings 1151 and 1153 area is no further action. We have excavation of impacted soil at the 1167 area. The cavalry stables is a no further action site. At 662 and the 680 area we have excavation of impacted soil and also at the 669 area.

In east housing we have excavation for Fill Site 1 and monitoring of the groundwater seeps of El Polin Spring. Crissy Field, we have excavation of impacted soil at Sewer Lift 1 and at the Building 633 firing ranges. And no further action at the 611 area. In the Presidio hill area we have excavation of impacted soil in Nike swale and the Nike facility, and no further action in Building 302 and 1450 and 1451 area. In the Presidio Forest we are excavating Landfill 2 and Landfill 4. And we are excavating any impacted soil at the transfer station and Building 1750.

Coastal bluffs, we are excavating BBDA 1A, 1, 2, 4, and Fill Site 5, and we are excavating impacted soil at BBDA 4. And we are excavating the lower part of BBDA 3, and there is no further action on the other part of the site. We are excavating impacted soil in the 1827 area. There is no further action in Lobos

Creek and Graded Area 9. And there will be additional characterization at Mountain Lake. Those were all sites we have all spent a lot of time on and we have all come to agreement on. I think we should be extremely proud of that and I want to thank you all of you for taking your time and effort to do this. It is really exciting when you are looking at it now.

So these are one side of Landfill E, which is what you heard about today. I think you will hear a little bit more from Doug about additional meetings. We are at issue with only one site out of all the sites we have had here. So it is where we are at on all of that. Are there are any questions?

MR. MILLER: I want to say about some of the agreements tonight, I think it is remarkable how positive a step that is. And, I guess, I think everybody who actually was immediately involved like Mark, Doug, and yourself, and all the other people on the team that put that together -- because some of the things that were announced here are things we worked on for several years. It is truly remarkable for me to hear so much agreement on so many key sites. I want to thank everybody as a member of the RAB for seeing that through. I can only imagine how difficult and how many meetings it took to get to that point.

MR. BERMAN: In the Baker Beach disturbed areas some of that looks fairly inaccessible in terms of actually how the excavation is going to be done. And so, when you say "excavate" I have a question mark.

MS. REACKHOF: It will be an engineering challenge.

MR. BERMAN: Right. And so presumeably, although the remediation concept has been stated in terms of excavation this is really not well defined in some areas because of the technical problems.

MS. REACKHOF: Obviously, when you get to the remediation and stability work -- that is when you start looking more closely at each one of these sites, which is what we will be doing, at that point we are committed to excavating any impacted area of those sites so the restoration for all the Baker Beach sites can move forward. MR. BERMAN: So I guess that leads me to my question, which is you haven't really decided on the technology for the excavation there at this moment?

MS. REACKHOF: No we haven't come to any conclusions. Obviously, we will be having engineering firms that will be looking at that. I know you had brought up the different vacuum-type of excavation similar to the shale use at one meeting on removing different components of the site, which we will be taking into consideration. And I think, as we had mentioned before, if anybody has any ideas we will be definitely be entertaining all of that as we move forward to clean up all of these sites.

MS. CHEEVER: Is a decision on Landfill 8 being deferred, then?

MS. REACKHOF: At this point Landfills 8 and 10 are part of a different component and are not a part of the Feasibility Study. We are actually talking internally about how to best approach those sites without maybe reopening the record of decision, but yet meeting all the goals of all of the

stakeholders as far as additional characterization and stabilization. So that is sometime on the table. It is just not actually part of the Feasibility Study at this time, and we are actually looking to get some information to move forward with that.

MR. BERMAN: You were mentioning there are some other sites on the Presidio that were not in the original Feasibility Study and they have sort of haven't been very well discussed, and I was wondering whether there is any plan to consider those at all?

MS. REACKHOF: There are additional sites that were brought forward during our negotiations with the Army. There are other operable units and other sites. We will potentially go through the Youngkin report, and the Trust isn't letting all those things go through the cracks. We obviously want to back away and feel good about having a clean park for all the people to enjoy. And so, it is still part of the package. It might come a little later in the process.

MR. BERMAN: Is there any documentation on how many others there are? I mean, Mark had gone through and listed a number of other sites.

MS. REACKHOF: We have all of that.

MR. BERMAN: Has there been any look at those? MS.

REACKHOF: Not at this time. That is not something we will be doing right now. We are focusing on the Feasibility Study.

I have some additional information on what else we are doing as part of the Feasibility Study. As I mentioned briefly, there will be trenching at Fill Site 6

tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. If anybody wants to come by and stand back and see some dirt being dug up and see George in his glory, come on by. It should be interesting and should be an all-day affair. Bring snacks, Doug, right?

MR. KERN: We will be eating directly from the landfill materials.

MS. REACKHOF: Battery Howe Wagner, we are going to be submitting some plans. However, I want an opportunity to talk with the stakeholders and various agencies on their ideas on what type of sampling activities we would like to do there. And then I have a consultant on board who is going to be moving forward with that. In the meantime we can at least get the process moving forward. And so, hopefully, we can get out there in real time to do some assessment from there and utilize that information for the Quintex draft Feasibility Study.

MR. KERN: For those who don't know what Quintex is, could you tell them?

MS. REACKHOF: Quintex looks at all the different archeological and native resources and impacts. I don't know if -- Brian, maybe you can speak more to that.

MR. ULLENSVANG: It is a review process set up within the park essentially to comply with the National Preservation Act. So it looks at cultural features and archeological features to insure that the work that is proposed for any sort of project doesn't disrupt the harmony of the cultural resources in the

park.

MS. REACKHOF: Upcoming meetings or meetings that have been ongoing, we have had quite a few meetings with all the stakeholders to discuss background cleanup levels and screening levels so when we do move forward and want to remediate the sites we will all be in agreement for what levels and how deep to go and what we need to be looking for. We should be moving forward with those in real time and hopefully have that taken care of.

We do have the outstanding meeting that we have been promising on the ARARs. The Trust provided ARARs to the NPS just recently. The ARARs govern difficult regulations for each of the sites on how you would remediate and other things with that. And the Park Service is reviewing them and once we go ahead we are going to give that to all of you to take a look at. And we will be having a follow-up meeting to discuss them with you and what they are about and how they fit into the Feasibility Study process. Groundwater monitoring program -- the Trust obviously finally has a consultant on board to move forward with Presidio-wide groundwater cleanup activities. As you recall, to date we have only been doing groundwater monitoring activities at those sites which are required because they have decision documents, but we have been actively trying to get on board and supplementing the information that the Army had been collecting over the Presidio for many years. And so we anticipate getting out there early next month to begin and conduct our first round of Presidio-wide groundwater sampling activities. And once we get the

health and safety plan and field sampling plan together, we will submit it to agencies and RAB for your review and we will be getting any comments back on those documents.

Mountain Lake -- we did some sampling out there the week of the 22nd of January. It was successful. No one fell in the water and it rained the whole time. Poor Jane, it was her first community relations job out in the field, but she seemed to enjoy it quite a bit.

MS. PACKER: I survived.

MS. REACKHOF: We are getting data trickling in. We want to get it validated before we share it with everybody. We anticipate some verbals and maybe some emails out to everybody the week of February 18th on where we stand on the Mountain Lake. Lastly, there is community relations.

MS. PACKER: The community relations plan, as you know, was issued last month. And I know some of you have taken a look at it and we are getting some comments back. We are also working on the cleanup news. I have been talking with several of you and working to have a RAB site where I can do articles and spotlights and where there is information you guys would like to see in the newsletter. MS. REACKHOF: Any questions on any of the status updates? Okay. I will turn it over to you, Doug.

MR. KERN: Shall we -- do you want to take a five-minute break while I switch the projector and we will come back in five or ten minutes.

(Break taken from 8:20 p.m. to 8:35 p.m.)

MR. KERN: I was asked to do an update on some of the details of some these sites, and it is very exciting and very optimistic, and this leads us with the direction we are moving in. You have seen a lot of this before. I really have just updated my presentation on principal sites where there have been discussions.

As you recall we divided all these sites into working groups. We had six sites with a lot of discussion, about eight with some discussion, and no-discussion sites were about 32. Now we will get into some updates.

Okay. These are the usual watersheds: Fort Scott, Lobos Creek, Coastal Bluffs, Tennessee Hollow. Battery Howe Wagner is right here. Okay. You have seen the pictures with the green goo leaking out. The issue here was constructing a permeable cap with soil in place. And what has happened after further discussion is it seems appropriate to investigate the size of the landfill. And that is really the update here. As Sharron mentioned there will be some trenching to really see how much is really there at Landfill E, and to try to pin down the location of the carbon tetrachloride.

Did I say Landfill E? I have Landfill E on the brain. It is all merging into one joint Landfill E. We are talking about Battery Howe Wagner, and we are going to do some trenching. We are going to find out what the carbon tetrachloride level is and what has yet to be discovered. MR. BERMAN: Just remind me again, the carbon tetrachloride source was thought to be now outside the Battery Howe Wagner?

MS. REACKHOF: Correct, and we are going to be going out and doing additional investigation to find where it is potentially coming from.

MR. BERMAN: So, if it is not in any of the sites and if it is out of Battery Howe Wagner, then what?

MS. REACKHOF: That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to make a final determination.

MR. BERMAN: If it is out of Battery Howe Wagner, then what?

MS. REACKHOF: Then once it is discovered --

MR. BERMAN: It will become a new site.

MS. REACKHOF: Potentially. We have to go through all the documents to ascertain whether it is a new site. MR. BOGGS: If it is a same site, rather than give it a separate site name, we will include it with Battery Howe Wagner. It is really -- the contamination itself is the site.

MR. BERMAN: So you -- even though the source may be geographically different it is still part of the package?

MR. BOGGS: Yes.

MR. KERN: Lobos Creek -- there are a variety of sites here: Nike facility, Nike Swale, Graded Area 9, which you heard about tonight, Landfill 8, 10, Mountain Lake, Building 1750. These are some of the resources along Lobos Creek we are trying to protect. Mountain Lake and Landfill 8 -- it was reported tonight that this site and Landfill 10 we are looking at the record of decision and we are trying not to reopen that. That is one of the efforts that is

ongoing, but still is open to address the concerns that come with these sites. So that is under discussion. That picture doesn't change from month to month. So that is really where that stands. Graded Area 9, we heard a great presentation from Tom tonight. This is the 4x4 race track that he was talking about and there is not a lot of good habitat up there for quail at the moment. And the update, as you see, is we are bringing in sand to establish that dune scrub habitat.

Landfill 10, that falls into the same pattern of discussion around the record decision. It has yet to really be discussed within the RAB. Again, Nike Swale, there is no particular update on this site at the moment. There was additional characterization, I think, requested. Did that happen or is that still to be done?

MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe it still has to be done.

MR. KERN: Okay. Coastal Bluffs sites -- here is the area of interest: particularly Fill Site 5 and Baker Beach Disturbed Area 3. Now, you heard tonight that the proposal is to excavate the lower portion and to have no further action on the upper portion of Baker Beach Disturbed Area 3. So that is the lower portion. This is the upper portion. Is that about right? Everybody is nodding, okay.

On Fill Site 5 do you see that slightly brownish area? That was the area where there was possible groundwater contamination as drawn in the EKI document. The larger red gob is Fill Site 5, and that may be drawn a little bit large. We will talk about that in a second.

You have seen these pictures. Here is the interesting red overlay shimmering over Disturbed Area 3. This site -- similarly this road is the dividing point between the lower area and the upper area. And that is looking down into a lot of the debris down the hill. And this is the site, the downhill portion, that is to be proposed to be excavated. Here is some of the debris on the surface. This is the downgradient seep going out onto Baker Beach and Fill Site 5. The size of the site is being reviewed. It looks like it was drawn just a little bit large for other purposes. And so the actual total cost within the estimates may be a little high. That is being evaluated.

Anything anybody wants to add on Fill Site 5 or Disturbed Area 3 at the moment? So the remedy is still clean closure at Fill Site 5.

MR. BOGGS: I could add a little something to the discussion on Baker Beach 3. The Department has had some concern regarding the groundwater below Baker Beach 3. We feel it hasn't been adequately characterized. What the Department is doing with a decision for Baker Beach 3 is that there would be what would be an interim rap to allow the excavation of the material, and then after that appointment the groundwater still needs to be clean before we will sign off on the site. So we are agreeing with what is being proposed, but the site won't be signed off on until the groundwater is documented to be clean.

MR. BERMAN: Where are you going to sample the groundwater?

MR. BOGGS: What is being proposed is after they remove the

debris, basically in the center of the footprint where the debris was right now. Because there are large chunks of concrete in the fill it would be very difficult to adequately characterize the groundwater.

MR. BERMAN: Are you proposing a detailed plan or is one well going to be enough?

MR. BOGGS: We wouldn't be in the position of proposing it as much as saying whether the Trust's characterization proposal is adequate.

MR. KERN: Other questions? Okay.

Tennessee Hollow, here is the general area of contamination in that area. Fill Site 6, this is eminent and kind of exciting. We are looking at this mounded area and tomorrow morning, as Sharron mentioned, between 7:30 and 8:00, I think, people are going to be out at the site in their hardhats and steel-towed boots ready to have the excavator look and see what is in this pile.

MR. FORD: If you come a little later in the morning you will probably see more. If you show up at 7:30 it will look like that picture. It will take us a little while to get some holes open, so there will be something to see.

MR. BERMAN: You had some preliminary information on this, right? Didn't you think it was mostly going to be construction debris?

MR. FORD: I think that is the thinking is. We think that it is mostly construction debris from buildings that either formerly existed on that site or right adjacent. So that is what we are going to try to find out, to see if it is construction debris or if there is trash in there.

MR. KERN: Perfect Valentine's day gift for this group actually is the digging. Okay.

Landfill E, we had a meeting last week -- a week ago on this site. This remains one -- I guess it is now the focal point of future discussions. We kicked it off. Perhaps it would be good to look at this. You have seen these pictures. This is upgradient water. This is downgradient water seeping out of the landfill.

I mean, previously we have had a meeting with contractors discussing the capping alternative principally, and it would be a fairly extensive cap as currently thought. Materials would be moved from the toe of the landfill pile on top. Perhaps the shape of the cap would encourage run off and yet maintain a flat surface. There are issues about methane that have to do with the design and capturing that. So those are some of the discussion points that have been previously talked about.

In our last community meeting we, again, went through some of the contaminants. We pulled out a variety of hosting maps and looked at what is found there, and there is a great variety of things. We began looking at what it would take, what is involved with a complete excavation. There was some discussion about can you do hot spot removal, could you partially excavate it, what are some of the additional costs associated with the capping alternative. And then we got into the cost structure of all of the Main Installation sites.

And I will unfold this magic spreadsheet of grand proportion, and I will read

that, I am sure, soon. This is all the sites in the main installation, so you can really see them all on one piece of paper and try to decide things about the costs. What we did is across every alternative, line up every line item, so then you could see the total cost across all the sites, things such as perimeter fencing. That is some \$270, 000. You can really look at it and make some judgments about how if you were not to do the proper mobilization, all of the things that the Trust will do to save money. You can really see where things are falling out in this plan. So I am sure that some of this information will be used towards reducing costs wherever possible. As Mary said, there is unlimited salmon desired out here to be consumed, and so I am going to have to think about Landfill E now in terms of smoked salmon.

We also looked at cost structure of Landfill E itself. We pulled out the estimate for that one site. For excavation it is 16 million dollars. For a cap it is some 4.3 million. And I took some time to try to illuminate where that cost might be inflated. I passed around some different estimates and we ended up with a proposal that I can just pass around for general information. I am not going to really go into detail about the costs tonight because of what was discussed at the meeting.

George in particular responded to Sam's request. Sam, said, "Well, you know, maybe you should really look at these costs, " and George said, "I guess I will. " So we took that to be a show of good faith on everyone's part. So we are going to withhold a lot of detailed discussion tonight about costs unless

people have any questions. But we have hit the tennis ball to George, and he is doing something with it, like applying rosen to the ball or pumping it with air or something, and will hit it back to us. We will hit it back and forth.

This piece of paper that I just handed out is just one way of showing that it is possible to demonstrate that all the sites could be remediated for the 41 million that was originally proposed for the Main Installation sites and still have some money left over. But as we keep on saying, we are going to hear some stuff back from George and other folks around the table about whether this is really reasonable.

Anybody that was at that meeting care to comment at all on what I have said so far? Any comments about Landfill E? It obviously remains as the discussion site. I think there are areas -- I think there is room in the budget to trim it down reasonably and not leave things exposed.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I would just say that I think there is maybe a need for another meeting on Landfill E coming up. I think there is a lot of material on Landfill E. As I am going back through stuff from 1997, there is an extensive -- I have EPA comments on Landfill E. So there is a lot of information and data on Landfill E that has scattered around. And I think the meeting we had last week was very helpful in bringing some of that together in my mind, and also raised more questions than it kind of answered. So I think another working meeting about this would be a good idea. We can do that at the fourth Tuesday committee meeting if that is okay.

MR. BERMAN: One of the major differences in the numbers between the Doug's estimate and the EKI estimate is subdividing the landfill into the Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 categories. And there is a major difference in Doug's assertions as to what that division is, and, of course, that has a lot of do with the disposal costs and the weight. That has a very serious monetary consideration associated with it.

So I am not sure, you know, what effort has to be done in order to ascertain the correctness of your assumptions or EKI's. I think they are both assumptions because of the lack of detailed characterization. In view of what Mark just said about EPA comments, I wonder if it is possible from documentation that we have already, to go and look at that question a little bit more in detail because, I mean, there are many millions of dollars tied up between those two different assumptions.

MR. KERN: Right. I think -- well, you can look at the logs again perhaps to see if that information was available.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I didn't quite catch that question. MR. KERN: Sam was saying that there is some difference between some of the estimates that I did and EKI did in terms of Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 ratios.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Well, I think they are all just sort of Educated best guesstimates to date. I have looked through the logs too, and it is difficult to come up with exact percentages of these three different categories.

MR. BERMAN: Right, but it is not so much exactly what they are, but they are very qualitatively different between EKI's and Doug's estimate. And there were millions of dollars of difference in cost estimates. So to me -- this is an amateur look at this. It seemed to me one of the major considerations they tried to tie down -- and I don't know what would be involved in doing that, but maybe looking at the EPA documents and focusing on that issue is something that we might consider in a community meeting. And maybe we could get some thoughts from EKI and George both on this. And it seems that such is a major point in the difference of the pricing. And then I don't know how George is prioritizing how he is going to look at this, but a quick look from last week's meeting was that that seemed to be a really major component in the difference in costs.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I agree with you, and I think there is a lot of this kind of stuff in the data. What we are doing now is going back and looking through these various data sets and trying to come up with a fresh look at the whole thing, both cost and technical data.

MR. KERN: These were some of the things that we were focusing on: the groundwater model, geotechnical stability compatibility with future restoration issues. And we were trying to develop some sort of creative alternatives that wouldn't necessarily be creative just in terms of how you dig it, but more perhaps creative in focusing possibly the desire for additional technical information.

One of the, I think, issues that Sam is touching on is if you really can't decide from the current logs and the current chemical data, and people seriously want to explore this, what kind of a sampling program could reduce the risk? That was really hugely contaminated site. How can you look at the landfill to see what it is really composed of? Is it really the absolute worst site on the Presidio? One of the things that could help this site is separating it out from the pack. And people were beginning to talk about the possibility of separating this out so that we could have some time for review so we could get some experience in the field. What are the real costs? What kinds of things are we finding in the landfills? Are the EKI estimates really quite valid? Are they being matched or when you get done with a landfill excavation -- which people are kicking around ideas of trying to get some of those done soon, just to see what they really cost.

And if you were to do this for a year or two you would get a lot of information about what you had and how much it cost? And that might bear on people's, you know, view of the risk at Landfill E. So that is another consideration as to the possibility of separating it from a pack.

So I don't really need to go over this again. This is just, again, another quick review. We are going to investigate Fill Site 6.

Landfill 8 is static. There has been some discussion, I think, in previous meetings of Landfill 10 regrading the kind of significant impact. This is under consideration. Landfill E -- we just talked about Battery Howe Wagner. We

looked at the size. One thing about the cost of that particular site right now is it is about \$50, 000 in the estimate to actually do the work, and about 1.8 million in groundwater monitoring. And we think that that is probably reversed of what you want to be doing at this site. So that one is going to be coming under scrutiny.

Battery Howe Wagner -- we mentioned Baker Beach Disturbed Area 3, the lower half. So here is where we are. The Public Health Service Hospital sites except for Graded Area 9 -- that is a mistake. They are on hold for the moment. There are internal discussions, particularly about the record of decision. We are making a lot of progress. There is a tremendous amount of progress now. I think we are reasonably within one site of consensus, and I think there is a lot of consensus.

That is my view of where it is and where the major discussion points need to be. Now, with Landfill E -- and we want to continue to thank the Park Service, all the members of the Park Service, who join in on this and staff and managers, management of the Trust for their support of our continuing input. And we want to thank them as well because they spend time, nights, when they are not with their families. And also the regulators, thanks a lot to you guys for coming out. That is what I had. Any questions?

MR. BERMAN: This is the first time I heard this suggestion about separating off Landfill E from the rest and letting it percolate, with no pun intended. A lot of other things are going on. Is that something that the Trust

has considered as an option?

MR. KERN: My view is that is being thought about. The principal reason it would be thought about is you can take all the sites that Sharron talked about where there is agreement and move that chunk ahead. And there is no particular rush for Landfill E. Nobody is going to forget about it. I am not going to forget about it. I think they are considering it just as a way of facilitating progress on all the other sites. Would any of the Trust like to speak to that?

MS. REACKHOF: All options are being discussed with the stakeholders.

MR. KERN: Anything from the Park Service on that idea?

MR. ULLENSVANG: No, we are amenable to options. MR.

KERN: Unless there are any other questions on that update we will go on. Are there any sites?

We are over to Bob and Jim from the regulatory agency on status updates.

MR. BOGGS: I will just briefly to review of some of what we have been looking at and working on that Sharron mentioned earlier. First, I have been participating in meetings with all of you. Thank you. It is definitely an evening of thank yous for everybody's work here. And we have recently been doing a lot of work on background metals calculations and concentrations. These will basically effect cleanup levels, and at what level when we are cleaning up a site we have got metals naturally occurring here. So we aer

determining when we are in this naturally occurring soil and what is an appropriate cleanup level. We have spent a lot of time on that.

We recently had our quarterly bi-monthly meeting. The schedule was discussed last month with Sharron and where all the projects are going. We currently have several documents in review: the Community Relations Plan, the rifle range, and we have recently been working on the MRI. The department has been working on how to accommodate contingency plans being proposed.

I.e. when they are doing utility work or sub surface work around the Presidio, if they run into a small area of contamination, how can we allow them to deal with that, i.e. dig and haul, so it doesn't hold up big construction and leave a big dangerous hole, et cetera. So the department after going through several layers of management now, have figured out a way of tying to get this contingency plan implemented and have it be a document that is submitted for public review and approval and submitted with a record of decision. That is pretty much it in a nutshell. Any questions?

MR. BERMAN: Presently is there a minimum or maximum that can be overlooked in any operation, or does it get down to one thimble full? Are there some guidelines now of how big a site has to be if you accidentally discover it before it has to be considered in the contingency plan?

MR. BOGGS: Right now the way the department is positioning itself on the contingency plan is anything greater than 5 cubic yards of soil

requires our being called in and conferring on what is being proposed. If the site has groundwater contamination it will not be able to be remediated per the contingency plan. It will have to go through the whole process. It is really intended for small areas.

Say, they ran into something when they were putting electrical in from one side of the building to the other; if it is something they could do quick and easy that would be fine. It would only be for remedies when they are digging up the entire contamination. And it will have cleanup levels that are the same as the cleanup levels in the FS. So it will be at least as stringent, if not more stringent, than any other remedies being proposed. Our view is that since it would be a contingency plan it would be more conservative and potentially lower cleanup levels. That would be something that could go through the whole process where you are evaluating specific risk exposures and that sort of thing. In the absence of going through all that process we will have more conservative, more stringent clean-up levels.

MR. BERMAN: So, then, does that mean that there is a kind of subliminal contractor obligation that arises from that?

MR. BOGGS: I am not exactly sure. I mean, there is an obligation that anybody doing work here has to be made aware of potential hazards, and if they run into some hazard, that contractor I don't believe would be required to mitigate it, but they would be required to notify the appropriate people upon evidence of that.

MR. BERMAN: Right, but let's say something is discovered and it is larger than the 5 cubic yards and some remediation has to be considered, and then the contractor is right there, but he hasn't put that in his bid to deal with that. So is all that part of the contingency plan monies that will become available to do that? How does this actually work in real action?

MR. ULLENSVANG: Sam, it may be helpful to know during the Crissy Field construction we had contingency plan set up, which was not unlike what is being proposed now. And there were a number of cases where petroleum contamination was discovered during the excavation and in all of those cases the construction contractor was able to move around while the Trust came in to do the work. In some cases there was cooperation where the construction contractor helped with the job. In other cases it was completely separate and the Trust came in and did the work, and it required very close coordination.

So there aren't additional charges. Ultimately, in your construction contract you bill in options such that if there are additional charges you can negotiate them up front so you don't have to sit around and wait while you figure that out. You can move forward in a way that is economical.

MR. BERMAN: Right. Presumably the Trust does this in their contract arrangements somehow because otherwise there is always a potential for some discovery. MR. ULLENSVANG: And they would have to build in those options to either have the contractor stand by, do another area of the job

site, or work under their direction. It will be very job specific, I would imagine.

MR. BOGGS: If I can add one more thing, Sharron had mentioned we have been requested for our concurrence to place this beach dune sand in Graded Area 9. Discussions with our management is we are tentatively in agreement with what is being proposed. We do want to chime in on any community input. So within the next week if you could provide Doug with any heartburn you guys may have about that proposal or any concerns you have we would love to hear them.

Our approval is basically going to have a caveat in it that the since the Trust's remedy hasn't been decided and we discover plutonium or something in there, and we have to do something, the Trust would be digging up the sand at their own risk and cost since there is no final decision on it yet. We think the risk is extremely low that that would happen based on review of the data, but we are tentatively ready to give our concurrence unless there are some concerns brought to our attention.

MR. FORD: The Trust acknowledges that we are taking that risk. You know, if it all goes wrong we would have to move the sand off of there, but we agree that we think that is a fairly small risk and this would be a sensible thing to do.

MR. KERN: Anything else?

MR. BOGGS: No.

MR. KERN: Thank you, Bob. Anything, Jim?

MR. PONTON: No.

MR. KERN: Any new business? Any items that need to be brought to the attention of the board tonight? Action items, looks like Mark put one on the table for the next committee meeting, a future meeting on Landfill E stuff. Action item, if you are interested in moving dirt, you won't get to do it, but you can watch it happen tomorrow. If you really give George some pocket change or something he might let you drive the tractor, I am sure. MR.

FORD: I think we have a new backhoe and a new operator down there.

MR. KERN: A new backhoe?

MR. FORD: I haven't seen it myself. It would probably be big and yellow. That would be my guess.

MR. KERN: As always agenda items coming up over the next few weeks give to Mark. Anything else from anyone tonight?

MR. KINGSTON: When Bruce Anderson was here tonight he indicated that we may be moving these meetings to Building 50 or the Officer's Club. The Trust has spent considerable bulk of money there preparing for future exhibitions and they are planning on having a meeting place there. So if you get your next month's meeting agenda, make sure you look at the location. Make sure you know where the location is.

MR. KERN: So it might be at the other location next month?

MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

MR. BERMAN: What building is that?

MR. FORD: The Officer's Club is right at the top of the parade group.

MR. KERN: Thanks for mentioning that. That is a good place to talk about it. Do we know that for sure? MS. REACKHOF: This is the first I have heard of it.

MR. KERN: Okay. So we will try to get the information confirmed as to whether it is here, there or wherever.

MR. ULLENSVANG: You may want to clarify the next committee meeting. The agenda talks about a meeting next week and Mark mentioned the 20th.

MR. KERN: The 20th would be next week.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I think there were a couple of conflicts with the 27th.

MS. WRIGHT: We discussed the 20th, but I don't know if it was decided on.

MR. YOUNGKIN: We talked about Wednesday of a normal week.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I just don't think anyone came to a resolution.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Brian couldn't make it to the Tuesday meeting.

MS. WRIGHT: I couldn't either.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Are we changing the committee meeting?

MR. KERN: Perhaps we should confer and then get the

information out via email what the date is.

MS. MONAGHAN: I have the 13th and the 21st. That is what I have in my book.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Doug, I think now that we have three different dates mentioned we need to sort it out and email it.

MR. KERN: Okay. Anything else? Then without further ado, meeting adjourned. Thank you for coming.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.)

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Jerry Anderson

Sam Berman

Bob Boggs, EKI

Edward Callahan

Julie Cheever

Dennis Downing

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Julian Hultgren

Doug Kern

Scott Miller

Jan Monaghan

Jane Packer

Jim Ponton

Kate Poole

Sharron Reackhof, Presidio Trust

Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

Tracy Wright

Gloria Yaros

Mark Youngkin

---oOo---

0313rab.txt

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

March 13, 2001

7:14 p.m.

---o0o---

MR. KERN: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to our regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. I would like to welcome the Presidio Trust, the contractors, National Park Service representatives, our regulatory community, the community members, the board, and any members of the public that are here tonight. Thanks for coming.

Does everybody have an agenda? And are there any proposed changes or a decisions to the agenda? I am seeing none. The agenda stands. Are there any announcements? I am seeing none. Committee reports, any committee reports?

MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our regular RAB planning committee meeting on February 27th, and we talked about several topics. We discussed the pilot excavation of Landfills 4 and 5. I believe this is on the agenda tonight, so we will talk more about that. We basically went over what we are going to do here tonight. We will discuss Landfill E again. We are finishing up the review of data, and maps, and everything for Landfill E. So we

1

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

have concluded that phase. We are planning on putting out

our findings in notes we have taken together into a report.

So by the next RAB meeting, I believe, we will have a summary of what we have come up with, and recommendations and everything on the Landfill E study. And the Presidio Trust also reiterated its longstanding commitment to capping Landfill E. We had a discussion of that, which is nothing new.

We also talked about the responsiveness summary a little bit. And we had spent some time on membership issues. We discussed having thank-you letters sent out to two of our longtime RAB members who left recently. We are putting together a thank-you letter to send to them. And also we discussed putting an ad in the paper for a new membership drive. And if anybody wants to expand on the membership stuff, go ahead.

MS. MONAGHAN: Nothing new, sorry.

MR. YOUNGKIN: That is it. Our next meeting will be on the fourth Tuesday, which I don't know the date of. It is the 27th of March.

MR. KERN: Very good.

MS. CHEEVER: This is just a little addition. A couple of months ago we were shown the Community Relations Plan, and I said I would like to read it. So I was asked to make a report through the Planning Committee. When I did

2

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

that -- I guess it was two weeks ago -- a couple of people suggested I make a report to the RAB as a whole. So I have a very tiny, short report. Do you want me to give it right now?

MS. MONAGHAN: I have it with me.
Page 2

MS. CHEEVER: It seems to be very well written. It follows along the 1996 plan some of us reviewed for the Army. And actually it has a lot of great background in it and also applicable laws. This might be very useful to new members or current members. And I just had two very small comments, which I had relayed to the Planning Committee. One is about contact with the public, other than us community members on the RAB. And the plan does point out a number of ways that this would happen at milestone moments.

In the remediation there would be large public meetings that would be given quite a bit of notice in the press. And, of course, there is the newsletter, and press releases, and things like that. But one thing I have had on my mind over the years is that these board meetings are also a very nice, good time that the public can learn what is going on and can be informed with the public, as well as us. And just as an acknowledgement of that, I thought that -- as I have for a long time -- I am going to suggest that the Committee Relations Plan say in the section on the RAB

3

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

that there will be some notice, public notice, in the general press, not just the announcements of the RAB meeting. It doesn't have to be large-scale blanket notice. But just a carefully selected announcement in the newspaper that a lot of people read would be good.

The other point I noticed is there is a section of it that says, under DTSC guidelines, 30 days would be given for public comment on documents. And I think all of us at

the RAB know that in many cases there is a need to comment quickly and expeditiously on things. But there might be some time be a situation in which we would need more than 30 days to comment for one reason or another, such as is usually present in a complex situation.

So, again, I might like to request a change of wording in the Community Relations plan to say that an extension of an additional 30 days to a total of 60 days can be requested or granted when appropriate. The reason I am even making this request is that the Community Relations Plan does actually say within the plan that this guides public participation in the remediation process. So I am going to be making those comments. And I may circulate a letter in case anyone else wants to sign onto it. I guess there is a copy of the plan in the library, and I have one. Does anyone else want to say anything? Do you have any thoughts Jan?

4

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

MS. MONAGHAN: No. Those were the two comments I had.

MS. REACKHOF: Julie, if I could take a minute and respond. I appreciate your comments on that. We did have an opportunity this past week with Pat Ryan, who is a DTSC public policy chairperson, who is involved with the public policy here at the RAB. And we went through it, and talked about issues for the Community Relations Plan, fact sheets, all of that. One of the items I brought up, and I asked specifically about, was the ability to get out into -- what kind of newspapers we could advertise in for the RAB meetings, because I had also considered that as something

that should be utilized to let people know about the RAB meetings, other than the fact sheets and Cleanup News.

So we are definitely moving forward with that. And also I think we can all work together on putting some language in there to the effect that, as agreed to by all parties, and in such that such exception can be given on certain documents. As you all well know, we do that as a team already by letting people take a little longer. When people ask we always have simply granted extensions. So, we can also address that in the community relations plan. So, I really appreciate the input on it. I want you to know we were working on those couple of items.

MR. KERN: Any other comments for Julie? Thanks

5

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

so much for taking the time to review the document and comment for us. It is much appreciated. Did you want to take any time now with respect to the other issue?

MS. CHEEVER: This is my other project. It is something that I have thought of since the last Planning Committee Meeting. But my attention has been caught by the fact that the resignations of Andrew Lolli, who resigned for reasons of health, and Bruce McKleroy, who resigned from the RAB because he has another civic commitment that conflicts with these meetings on Tuesday nights. And I know that we have had a lot of respected colleagues who have come and gone over the years, but these are two people who are actually original members of the RAB when it was started in 1994, which according to my math -- since they resigned this spring -- means they were on the RAB for

seven years.

And I would like to propose that we actually pass a resolution just thanking them for doing that, because I think that is a real contribution, to have been on this board and come to these meetings for seven years. So if everyone is agreeable -- I know this is sudden, but I feel like doing it sooner rather than later. I would be delighted to read some wording I drafted. Any comments? Okay. Here is my wording.

"Whereas Bruce McKleroy and Andrew Lollo were members

6

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

of the Presidio San Francisco Restoration Advisory Board from the time of its founding in 1994 until 2001; whereas the participation of Andrew Lollo and Bruce McKleroy contributed significantly to the effective operation of the RAB, be it resolved, the Restoration Advisory Board commends and thanks Andrew Lollo and Bruce McKleroy for outstanding public service as members of the Restoration Advisory Board for the past seven years."

Any thoughts or suggestions?

MR. ANDERSON: I was wondering about having identical resolutions for each, with one name on it.

MS. CHEEVER: Sure. Does anybody think anything about that?

MR. KERN: I think that it might be nice for each to have their own individual resolution.

MS. YAROS: I assumed that was the way it was going to be. I thought you were reading it that way for expediency.

MS. CHEEVER: No, but that is fine.
Page 6

MS. YAROS: That way they could each have a thing to keep for themselves.

MS. CHEEVER: I know they both put a lot into it. And I feel like it might mean something to them. I know they are at different stages of their life right now. Any other suggestions about the wording?

7

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

MR. KERN: I think it is very thoughtful of you come up with that idea. And, I think without -- if there are no other comments, perhaps we should entertain a motion to pass this resolution. Is there anyone who would like to move this resolution?

MS. CHEEVER: I so move the two resolutions as read, but with a separate resolution for each member.

MS. MONAGHAN: I second.

MR. KERN: Is there any discussion on the resolutions?

MR. BERMAN: Will there actually be a written statement that they get?

MS. CHEEVER: Yes, the same one. Yes, definitely. So we will try to put it in a nice format.

MR. KERN: Any other discussion? All right. It has been moved and seconded, the resolution thanking Andrew Lolli and Bruce McKleroy for their service on the RAB. All in favor raise their hand. It is unanimous. The resolution carries. Thank you very much, Julie, for doing that.

MR. KERN: Are there any other committee reports? Then we would like to move on with item number 5, Project

0313rab.txt
Status Update with Chris.

MR. NELSON: Thank you. It is good to be back.
Excuse me if I am a little rusty. I am going to talk about

8

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

a couple of Presidio-wide projects and the Feasibility Study. First off with the Contingency Plan, we have been awaiting some final comments. We had a brief meeting with DTSC last week in anticipation of some draft comments. And there has been a slight change of plans in how we are going to move forward with the documents.

Essentially it will serve the same purpose, which is to treat discovery of unknown contamination in various construction activities. But we are going to be a little bit more proactive in complying with the national Contingency Plan by writing a Remedial Action Plan for these types of sites. So we will have an opportunity to do that as well. And the Contingency Plan will serve as a work plan for that.

We hope to receive the comments by anyone who is withholding them by the end of this month on the QAP. The final document was issued for approval from the DTSC on the 22nd of February. I understand their personnel are now reviewing it and making sure it is compliant. And we hope to receive comments from them or just an approval signature by next month.

Moving on, something that I missed by I think a week was the trenching of Fill Site 6. I understand that quite a few people were out there, and a lot of stakeholders were involved. It was a very nice day, I guess. I saw from a

9

picture that it was a nice day, and it was a very good idea to do this trenching. And we are actually now getting some data in. It is trickling in slowly, and we are working on doing some interpretation of it, and putting together some findings that we will be able to release in the near future.

Also, along the same lines of Battery Howe Wagner, in a similar effort to do some additional trenching, we have submitted all the internal paperwork for permits and what we need for compliance. We recently submitted a sample plan addendum to the Park Service for their approval. And once that is done it will be sent on to the State agency and the RAB. I don't anticipate there will be too many comments on that. I think we are all in agreement on what we are going to be doing out there.

We are planning, if everything goes well, and all the approvals go through, we will be out there the week of the 9th of April and sampling soil at Battery Howe Wagner. Also, on the Feasibility Study there have been some meetings. Right before I left in January there were a of background metals meetings. And stakeholders continue to meet and have met. We have built some consensus on coming up with screening and threshold numbers. And we are coming to a point where I think we can all agree.

There will be another meeting scheduled for next

Thursday, and then, hopefully, if we are all in agreement

0313rab.txt

we can put this to bed on the 3rd of April with final screening and what not. And we will incorporate all these changes from these new metal background numbers in the Feasibility Study document and also the tables that will comply with the Contingency Plan.

Lastly on Feasibility Study on the ARARs, we have received comments from the Park Service and we have put our consultants and lawyers on responding to those comments. And we anticipate being able to give those responses to comments back to the Park Service very soon. And hopefully we will be able to release them to all the other stakeholders in the near future. And, of course, we will have that final meeting on ARARs and landfiling regulations once that has been released.

So that is it on the Feasibility Study. Any other questions on that? As some of these things fall into place, the ARARs and background metals, we will be able to give you more information on the schedule; when we will of the document out for review and what not. We still have to incorporate the Fill Site 6 data and Battery Howe Wagner data. I am hoping it will be later this summer, June or July, for a draft to be due.

MR. BERMAN: In the ARAR submission by the Park Service, are there any surprises there. Are there any you

11

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

didn't anticipate in review of those ARARs?

MR. NELSON: No. We have been working with the Park Service for several months now. There has been a preliminary identification. Both parties have come together to have a meeting to discuss what is technical,

what is relevant and what is not. And sometimes there is a little negotiating and a little dancing that goes on. But, no, we are not surprised. And we are putting together some responses that are going to be acceptable to all parties. And then, of course, it is the state's turn to weigh in. So we will see how that fleshes out.

The groundwater monitoring program by Jennifer Coats -- we recently read and revised some comments from the Park Service. So we are going to be getting that, I guess, to the agencies very soon. I understand the community will do an expedited review, so we can get out and begin sampling in a few weeks. So I hope that everything is in order with that plan. Any questions on that?

MR. KERN: I guess I have something related to the groundwater monitoring program. I didn't have a chance to review the Building 637 monitoring session that was back in June, I think, of last year. And there were, I think, four sites in that that really reviewed 637 so far. I don't know if I am assuming that people within the Trust have reviewed this document. But on 637, I think, I would have

12

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

expected some other kind of statements because it was part of our remedy.

And it sounded more like just a standard monitoring report. There was a comment in it, for example, that the increase in oxygen levels were probably due to the oxygen release compound they inject into the subsurface. I mean, that was actually what we were trying to look for. And so, I was kind of expecting an analysis that would have looked

at those things. I was wondering if we could have some sort of a report down the road, maybe next month or at some point, that would maybe give more of the details of what people found when they were really examining that. I mean, would that work?

MS. REACKHOF: I am sorry. I think it might be a good time -- I would have to go back and look at that, Doug. From when we started getting into first Presidio-wide data, we have been in a lag. And we haven't gotten all the information from some of these sites that we would really like to have. Maybe when we get the next round, and we start getting that it would be something we could talk about. If we all sat down and talked about some of the ways we could look at that and write it up, it would be preferable to all parties.

And, obviously, we want to do something. Why would we put all the effort in and not follow it? I think it is

13

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

really important as a key site on what it does. And I think maybe we could either talk offline a little bit about what the best way it would be to do that. And as we move forward now with our new plan, I think it is time to bring that forward. So if you want to set a meeting, that would be great.

MR. KERN: If it would be more appropriate, I could provide some written comments.

MS. REACKHOF: It is up to you. I feel comfortable if we all get together. We have good working group meetings.

MR. KERN: Okay. We will set it up.

MS. REACKHOF: Thanks.

MR. NELSON: Moving on, I believe George is going to take it from here.

MR. FORD: Chris took the first part of Jennifer Coats's material for presentation. I am going to handle the second part. And I just hope that you all remember that when she is here next month to come up with a lot of questions for her. So she is getting a free ride this month.

Mountain Lake -- we have finally received the validated data. We actually got we got it yesterday. And it shows, basically, there are some elevated metals along the west side of the lake. The west side is where Park Presidio

14

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

Boulevard is. There are low pesticide detections in various places in the lake, but they are down pretty low around protection levels. They are down close to cleanup levels or below. But it really looks like metals are the story out at Mountain Lake.

And right now the Trust, the Park Service, and our consultant URS are going through the data and trying to figure out what it all means in terms of if any additional work would be required out there. And would it be done as part of the restoration of Mountain Lake or would it be a separate project. We are just trying to make sense out of it right now. And we plan to give a detailed update on it next month at the RAB meeting. It is possible that if there is a RAB committee meeting between now and next month that we may have a more detailed update ready by then. But

we will certainly have something a little more fulfilling to give to you next month.

MR. BERMAN: It may be premature, but when you say "some metals," can you give us any indications of which metals they were.

MR. FORD: I am not familiar with all the data. I know there are some high lead numbers. It appears that the flag that was raised by the burn and raid data" (What is this term? has been confirmed in some sense, but I don't know the details.

15

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

MR. BERMAN: So, is there lead in the lake itself or is it in the beaches?

MR. FORD: I think it is in the sediments, you know, at the bottom of the lake.

MR. BERMAN: If they come out to be above cleanup levels, does this mean there will be some dredging?

MR. FORD: The way I look at it is if the restoration goes forward there is going to be some dredging no matter what, you know. It is conceivable that that dredging area might be expanded or changed around to take care of some of the soil. But at this point, you know, we still have to look at all of the operations. We don't want to jump right into solutions. So it is a little bit premature.

MR. BERMAN: Was a sampling done deep enough in the sediment so you can know sort of what the symmetry of the position is?

MR. FORD: You know, I am not familiar enough with the data to sort of answer based on results. But I can

tell you I looked at the sampling plan. And I believe that the program that we did out there was extensive enough, both in terms of the area and the depth that we were actually sampling, that if there are patterns that can be discerned, I think we have enough data to figure out where the stuff came from or where it most likely came from.

16

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

Next month we should have had enough chance to go through the data in some detail and interpret it. So our plan is to come back to you with a much clearer statement of what it all means.

MR. BERMAN: Is the lead in any way easily identifiable as related to the traffic, and the lead coming from automobiles and tires? I mean, is there a simple analysis that can tell us that?

MR. FORD: That is actually out of my expertise. I don't know if anybody else know the answer to that.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I think in this case we have got a couple of ways to do that. One is by the spatial direction of results, which will lead us one way or another. There are ways through isotope studies of the lead. The data were collected were in that area. They weren't looking at the isotopes of the lead. It doesn't mean that couldn't be done. And that would be the traditional way. Sometimes that is feasible and sometimes it is not.

MR. FORD: It may be the pattern of occurrence with certain contaminants will be point pretty clearly in one direction or another. That is what we hope for anyway.

But at this time, we don't know for sure.

MR. BERMAN: Thank you.

MR. FORD: I am on to Graded Area 9. We asked for

17

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

DTSC's concurrence, and they gave it to us. We have a letter from DTSC that essentially approves placement of sand on Graded Area 9. Because of the nature of this, what we are doing -- they have to put plenty of caveats in it to make it clear that they are not really endorsing it necessarily, but they are failing to object. And they are saying that any work that is done out there would be at the Trust's risk. But anyway, we have concurrence. From a regulatory perspective we are good to go with dune restoration on the property.

The bad news is the golden gate park's sand, 3,000 cubic yards of it, fluttered away on gossip wings. Actually it didn't flutter away. Golden Gate Park decided they were going to keep it, and that we couldn't have it. So the Trust and actually the Park Service, because Tom Eckels is doing most of the hard work on this, are looking at sand from commercial sources right now trying to identify the sand. It is a little tough to find the perfect dune sand from a commercial source. So what Tom is trying to do is identify something that is pretty close, and that can be purchased at a reasonable price. So we are going through that process right now.

We have some hope of a possible May construction start. I have one question mark next to this bullet. There should probably be three or four question marks just because it

18

may take a little while to get through the procurement. If we are buying sand it is a pretty good size purchase, several hundred thousand dollars worth. So we can't run out and do a procurement like that at the drop of a hat. It takes a little time. So we are working through that, and hope to start the restoration work in the late spring or early summer. And we will have more updates on that next month as well. Any questions?

MR. BERMAN: I am curious, is there any uncontaminated sand in Fort Ord for the operation? There is a tremendous amount of dune there, and it all may be contaminated.

MR. FORD: Actually there is -- and Tom jump up and correct me if I stray into incorrect territory -- but Tom has looked into it. There is actually a sand quarry in the Marina, which, I think, is right at the south end of Fort Ord. And they have sand that, I believe, would be our first choice because it actually is a dune sand. There is a couple of problems with it. The biggest problem is that it is a two-and-a-half hour truck haul in here, which results in -- you end up with something like \$30 a cubic yard in hauling costs, something in that ballpark, plus the buying of the sand.

So it is beautiful sand, but it is very pricey by the time you get it up here. The other issue is that the

19

quarry down there is limited to some small number of yards

or tons per day. And if we needed 15 or 16 thousand yards of it, it would take a long time to get it from that source because we could basically consume their entire production every day for, something like, a month. And that would be just to get the minimum amount of sand that we would want. And because they are a business who has local customers who need sand, it is not very likely they would actually commit all their sand production to us.

So, you know, I suppose there is a possibility that some of that sand might be brought in sort of like a top dressing, but right now it is looking like between the purchase price and the hauling costs, that sand may be too expensive to be our choice. If anybody knows a way we can offload sand from a barge or something, we would sure like to talk about that because if we could were cut down our transportation costs uniformly, that would be good. We are fresh out of docks for unloading barges here at the base.

MS. WRIGHT: Just a comment on the time frame. I think before it was kind of a rush because you didn't want to lose the Golden Gate Park sand. That is not a issue of high priority now. I mentioned this last time. I want to make sure that core investigation isn't in the middle of quail season. I don't know what the season it is like in

20

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

the next few months means. If that would mean there won't be any nests that are disrupted, that would be great.

MR. FORD: I know the people are looking at the bird and wild life issues. But in all likelihood because we are not scrambling to get free sand, and we actually

have to go through the steps to pay for it, it is going to move more slowly and probably take longer. So there will certainly be plenty of opportunities to pay attention to the quail.

MS. YAROS: Did you say there were not enough docks to offload sand?

MR. FORD: There are basically -- it is sort of a familiarity of mine. The cheapest way to transport bulk materials like sand or gravel is with a barge. The problem with a barge is that you have got to unload it somewhere and it takes a specialized docking facility where you can bring in the barge. And depending on what is in the barge -- whether you have to scoop the material out, or pump it out, or whatever -- we don't have any of that here. Any sand that comes in here is in all likelihood going to have to be trucked in over the highway.

So that is why when we make estimates of what it would cost to bring sand, or gravel, or anything else into the Presidio, we have to figure that it will cost roughly \$70 or \$75 an hour for a truck for the full time that it will

21

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

take to get the stuff here. And that has basically been the problem with the sand down in the Fort Ord area. It is the transportation. The sand itself is relatively inexpensive. But to haul it up here, and truck it up here is very expensive because it is so far away.

We will go to the Petroleum Program. The Commissary clean up, I am happy to say, is actually in progress. We haven't moved any soil yet, but the contract has been

awarded. The contractor is on site, and he is doing things like setting up his stock piling areas, starting to remove pavement, putting up barriers and fences, and things like that. And shortly we will be breaking ground to actually do the cleanup.

As we talked about before, the cleanup is being done in two phases. We are working in the Commissary parking lot first, and then when that is done we will backfill the hole and reroute Mason Street through the Commissary parking lot, and close the portion of Mason Street that we need to dig up. The project is still on schedule for completion April 23, which is before the Crissy Field opening festivities.

So that is one that you can come down and take a look at if you would like. So it is going on day by day. The next one is Buildings 1065 and 207/231 corrective action plan updates. The Trust and Park Service and Harding

22

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

Lawson, who is our consultant, met at the end of the February to discuss the task list, and the schedule for doing these corrective action plan updates. Harding Lawson is now working on preparing estimating costs.

And the schedule we have asked them to look at is to enable us to have a final corrective action plan in the late summer, so that it would be possible to actually do the cleanup in either fall of this year, fall 2001, or spring of 2002, depending on how work at other sites plays out.

And, again, the 207/231 cap will take longer. We expect that is going to be finalized some time probably in

2002. And the actual cleanup will occur after that. And then the delay with 207/231 is just because of the complexity of the site because it is located right on Doyle Drive and the Tennessee Hollow restoration corridor.

Does anybody have any questions about the caps? Okay. Then we go on to Crissy Field. The skeet range has a draft work plan that I will be passing out towards the end of this meeting for the regulatory agencies and our regulators to take home with them and read when they have a chance. We are looking towards actually doing the cleanup in May and or June. We have picked those dates for a couple of reasons.

One is if we wait until after the opening ceremonies

23

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

for Crissy Field then we are not in a race to try to get out of the way before that occurs. And it also turns out that there are fortuitously low tides in mid-May and mid-June. And in order to complete this work efficiently what we are looking for are extremely low tides that occur during the daytime when we can have the work crew out there. And those occur in May and June. So that is what we are focusing on. And we expect that the work is going to be done by the Trust crews in house. So that will be one of the first outings for the Trust in the in house cleanup effort.

Crissy Field closure sampling -- I am still working on a draft closure plan. It is not ready to come out and see the light of day yet, but I think there is a pretty good chance that it will be out and in circulation for people to

review by this time next month. So check your mailboxes.
Any questions about Crissy Field?

Okay. And I think that brings us to my last item, which is the Pilot/Treatability Study Proposal that the Trust and the Park Service have been discussing. And actually they have sent a letter to DTSC on this topic. The Trust and the Park Service are jointly proposing a pilot or a treatability study that would look at clean closure of one or more landfills probably.

We worked with smaller landfills in the park. And part

24

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

of the goal would be to do this and work -- do the treatability work this summer and fall so that we would have the results of the study available to us before the Feasibility Study is finalized, and certainly before the draft of the main installation sites is prepared. The Trust and the Park Service are still discussing possible sites.

We are discussing mostly -- we worked with smaller landfills. The discussions have centered around Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, but final negotiations are still going on. So the final candidates haven't been selected yet. The purpose for this treatability or pilot study would be to -- we want to look at a number of different factors. We want to find out whether it is cleaner if you are doing clean closure of a landfill to contract out the work, or whether it can be done more cheaply by the Trust's work in house. We want to look at the potential for recycling some of the materials. You are invited to come out to some of these landfills to see if there is concrete or building debris.

We want to see if it is possible to separate those kind of materials efficiently enough that we can recycle them rather than just send them off to a permanent landfill. There are a few other issues we would like to explore, including we want to find out whether we can visually discriminate as to where the bottoms of landfills are, or

25

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

whether the actual achievement of a cleanup level will be -- you know, won't be a visible bright line and will have to be established by sampling repeatedly with depth.

And there are a few other things we want to look at, but the goal for this study is to collect enough information on the mechanics of doing these clean closures to see if we can't reduce some of the uncertainty in some of our cost estimates for doing the relatively large number of clean closures here at the base. So this is another one where I hope to -- I believe that by next month preferred sites will have been finally settled between the Park Service and the Trust. And we will be able to discuss this in considerably more detail, including schedule.

MS. CHEEVER: If you end up with very useful information about the costs or any of these other factors you mentioned, is there time to put that into the Feasibility Study?

MR. FORD: It will be a horse race. I mean, this study will take -- the way we envisioned it, the actual fieldwork would probably be done in the fall. And we would be -- it would sort of have the data towards the end of the year. And we would be interpreting it about the time we

expect the Feasibility Study to go final. So one of the things we have to think about is how to incorporate the data and get the benefit of the Feasibility Study.

26

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

And, again, we see that as sort of part of the process something we have to discuss. Our hope is if we can come to an agreement on sites that this would become a fairly high, top priority project we would be working on. We would have to jump right on it so we could get the paperwork that would be required in order to do what is left in the spring and during the summer. So we would be ready to do something in the fall.

MR. YOUNGKIN: So would you do one project in house and one subcontracted out? Is that it?

MR. FORD: That is the thinking so far, right. You know, we have an idea that it has been talked about quite a bit within the Trust. And we have an idea that it would be possible to save a considerable amount of money by doing certain things in house. But at this point it is just an idea. What we are talking about is trying to improve the savings could be realized.

One way to do it is to pick two landfills that are roughly similar, contract one out, and then count up the costs. Because, you know, there are a lot more -- it is more than just the difference in, you know, what a government backhoe operator gets paid versus a private sector one. When we contract out a clean closure of a landfill, you contract out the engineering design. And, basically, you have got to have a lot more paperwork to go

27

through the whole procurement process to get a responsive bid from a contractor that you can actually let a contractor get the work done for.

When we are doing things in house, most of the contracting aspect of it goes away, and you have the ability to do the work. Similarly, once you get an approved work plan from a regulatory agency, which you have to have whether you are contracting out or doing it in house. When you are doing it in house, once you have the work plan you are pretty much ready to go. So we think there is potential for savings both on the engineering end of it, and also some time. You know, we can get going faster. That is the way we are going with that.

MR. ANDERSON: If we have all these multiple goals like trying out different techniques and separating the products that you dig up and stuff like that, it kind of makes it hard. I assume that you would have to do all of that on the in house; one, because you can't really specify all of that in a contract; is that right?

MR. FORD: You know, I think we have the ability to. I think we could specify that in a contract. I mean, it would require some really good specification writing, but you know it is possible. I worked on projects where materials had to be segregated so that some of it could be recycled and other parts of it would just be disposed of.

28

So it is doable, but it is much easier, in terms of if you

are doing the work in house, because presumably you have a foreman there who says, "Put that over there and put that over there." It is as simple as that. When you are contracting it out you can't quite make it that simple, but it is possible.

MR. NELSON: I think it is important to point out, George, when you look at the two sites together there won't be a total comparison because the two sites that you mentioned were both small. But one may end up being larger and one may end up being larger. We worked with smaller ones that may have more hazardous materials and a larger one may have none. So that is going to affect your disposal cost. Transportation is probably going to be similar. You can't transport it.

So really, I think, there is going to be specific comparison for line items. But the bottom line will not really be comparable. In the end I think it is really the digging and the loading and the segregation, things like that, and the engineering and the oversight. Things like that would be comparable, but transportation, disposal, things like that, the bottom line ultimately will not be the same.

MR. FORD: Chris hit the nail on the head. It will take some careful interpretation of the data because

29

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

we don't have two landfills that are exactly the same. In fact, we really don't have a couple of them that are really close in size. So we are going to have to reduce things to unit costs and compare process and things like that. It won't be as simple as just, you know, totaling up all the

costs at the end, and saying costs are one million for the Trust to do it and 1.9 million for the contractor. It would be wonderful if we could do the analysis at that level, but I think we will have to pick it apart carefully.

MR. BERMAN: Do you have a preliminary response to DTSC on this plan?

MR. FORD: Let me try to make the response and then maybe DTSC will correct -- Bob can correct me. DTSC is interested in hearing what we have to say. We haven't proposed anything really specific enough for them. All we have proposed is an idea. I mean, they need to have a specific proposal that has got a lot of detail in it, so that they can for them to approve it or react to it. And we haven't given them that yet. So essential they have said, "Yes, we are interested. Please keep talking to us." But, you know, they can't promise anything at this point. Bob, how did I do?

MR. BOGGS: Quite well actually. Our concerns are, we share an interest in getting some of this work done, getting the data that can be gleaned from doing this

30

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

work, and having that information playing very importantly into further decisions, other fills, and sites at the base. So we are interested in the information. We are interested in moving the process forward.

We had a couple concerns in that we don't want this to be construed that it is necessarily a final remedy. We haven't given that approval until the FS goes through the all the public process, et cetera. There is a little bit

of risk there. As far as cleanup levels, they haven't been signed into agreement yet. These are preliminary discussions. We think that we can come to some agreement on the clean-up levels. They will be agreed upon by the time the work gets done. There are some hurdles to be worked through, but we feel we can work through them.

Our other concern was we didn't want this to circumvent the process. We want it to be done in the public arena so the public has a chance to chime in, and so their concerns get addressed as well. Those were our two primary concerns. As long as those are able to get addressed, we are in favor of moving forward on the process and discussing it further.

MR. PONTON: I guess it is in terms of the bigger picture. And with the schedule I was wondering if the petroleum project is being pushed out into the future so you can spend your time more effectively focused on the

31

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

treatability study in the short term.

MR. FORD: We are trying not to push the petroleum projects out into the future. And that is why I am trying to push the 1065 corrective action, which is sort of the big thing. I mean, other than the Commissary, the 1065 cleanup is the first big one on our agenda. But we are also in the process of lining up some tanks and mini-caps that will also be done this year. So our goal is to do it all. I mean, not to do any other work at the expense of petroleum. I guess that finishes it for me.

MR. KERN: Any other questions for George on any of these topics? Okay. We are at item 8 and reports from

our regulators, Bob and Jim.

MR. NELSON: Jane was going to go over community relations. Sorry, she is not on the agenda.

MR. KERN: Okay.

MS. PACKER: Just a couple things about the Community Relations Plan. Like Julie mentioned, we are just hearing back from everybody. And we are still incorporating the comments. We will issue the final edition, hopefully, soon. A reminder about the bimonthly meeting March 20th -- it will be at Building 1750 again.

And the cleanup news is we are looking at the deadline for any articles the RAB might want to put in. That will be March 23rd. That is all I have.

32

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

MR. KERN: Very good. Thank you. Now on to item 8.

MR. PONTON: I think you heard my comment.

MR. KERN: Thanks, Jim. Anything else?

MR. BOGGS: I want to just give you a little update on some of the activities that DTSC has been involved in and where our points of view lie on some of these issues. We completed our review of CRP. Our community relations specialist, Pat Ryan, met with Jane and Sharron last week. I think your comment, Julie, is great. I think those should be incorporated. And we are generally pleased with the document as well and any other public input.

On the Contingency Plan, we had a meeting last Thursday regarding the Contingency Plan. We went over some draft

comments that DTSC had. Chris was hoping they would be to him by the end of the month. Well, they went out yesterday. So you should have them shortly.

Background metals, we have been doing a lot of work really trying to get a good solid foundation into developing background level of metals here at the Presidio. There have been some problems in the past data because we don't have a lot of data from purely, clean Serpentine or purely clean beach dune. So we have really been working hard on trying to get that moved forward.

33

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

The Trust consultants have been putting a lot of effort in as well. As George mentioned, on Graded Area 9 we gave our contingent approval. Our letters caveats in there as well that we have an issue with the treatability study. I actually took that to my management because of the nature of it and that we would be doing this treatability study while taking away a whole landfill. As I mentioned earlier, we are generally in favor of continuing the discussions, and, hopefully, having it move forward in an acceptable way.

Also mentioned was the Quality Assurance Project Plan. That is currently in our lab for review. And we have been recently reviewing the groundwater monitoring reports that Doug mentioned. We have some significant technical concerns as well that will need to be addressed in other meetings as well. But as you mentioned, also data for Landfill 8 deserves discussion and explanation as well.

So hopefully within the next month or so we will really be ready to get that program back on track. That is it.

MR. KERN: Thanks, Bob. Any questions for Bob? Okay. Any new business? Let's see, action items. There have been a number of announcements. I am going to get in some comments and try to set up a meeting on 637. We have a resolution that has passed.

MS. CHEEVER: I will send in the wording. And

34

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

would it be appropriate for Jane to send it to the two people?

MS. PACKER: Sure.

MR. KERN: Perhaps. I don't know if the Trust would want to also include a cover letter or something.

MS. CHEEVER: I think we should also send a thank you letter. We can circulate that for people to sign.

MR. KERN: Right, instead of just receiving a resolution in the mail.

MS. CHEEVER: I thought we would propose wording on that to.

MR. KERN: There is a meeting March 20th meeting that Jane just mentioned, the bi monthly status meeting. There are some Contingency Plan comments that I can probably dig up. And we may have never have resubmitted those. I will do that.

MR. NELSON: We might still have them. We will let you know tomorrow.

MR. KERN: They would probably be the same. Any other action items?

MR. BOGGS: Just along that line of the Contingency Plan, just for everybody's information, we did

submit a comment letter yesterday. In summary, there were two main points that we had for the Contingency Plan. One was kind of technical regarding the cleanup level, that

35

♀

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

those needed to be worked out. And you generally want slightly more conservative cleanup levels.

The other main comment is we are requesting that this plan be put together with the RAB, or that it would become a document that is put out for public review and approval. I don't know how they are actually going to do that as to whether they will do one document or do a letter with the Contingency Plan as a work plan attachment. I don't know if that has been decided. But in any case, since it does interest actual cleanup actions, DTSC felt that those actual cleanup actions needed to be done through the NCP process, which does involve public review and approval. So provided that gets met. Those are our primary comments on that.

MR. KERN: Thank you. Any other action items? I think Mark mentioned that we were going to put out a report on Landfill E, hopefully by the next meeting. That is our target. And so we maybe we can circulate that for people to have input on that one. So it looks like it is going to be a fairly busy month. There are a lot of meetings and a lot of things that are being tied up. I have been participating with Bob and the Trust consultants, Michelle and Bruce, and Sharron, and a number of people on the background metals.

I would agree with Chris that those meetings have been

36

progressing, and there is some general consensus being formed. And I am pleased with how those meetings are going. Looks like we have got probably a couple more meetings to wrap that up. So that is kind of -- we should have more information for you. It is a really important part of this whole Feasibility Study to determine those levels. So I am really pleased with the work that is going on there.

Agenda items for our March 27th meeting would be maybe kind of following up on these items and perhaps reviewing Landfill E. Anything else you give to Mark as far as action items or agenda items. Any final announcements or items for this evening?

MR. YOUNGKIN: There was the trenching of Battery Howe Wagner.

MR. NELSON: Stay tuned for that. We will put out an announcement as to when it will happen for sure. I don't see any major problems with that date at this point in terms of approvals and things like that.

MR. KERN: I guess that reminds me of three other items we had put off with the Mountain Lake results. The Landfill 6 results are coming. And there was one other thing with --

MR. FORD: More details on the pilot study.

MS. CHEEVER: Do you picture making a presentation

37

on the Landfill 6 results or just issuing a written report?

0313rab.txt

MR. NELSON: Sure, absolutely.

MS. CHEEVER: Being there, I thought it was interesting. I would actually be interested to know -- almost see a picture of such and such trench, and find out what was here and what was found in that particular trench, et cetera.

MR. NELSON: I am not aware whether pictures were taken of the actual trench. I was probably trekking in Nepal at the time, but I would be glad to help, talk about the data, present pictures, et cetera, just like we did last summer on the Main Installation. I am glad you got to see the trenching. It is always fascinating to see cross sections of this site.

MR. KERN: They were wearing hard hats.

MR. NELSON: You will be expected to wear hard hats if you come to Battery Howe Wagner. We run a tight ship here.

MR. KERN: So there are a lot of things to follow up with at the next meeting. We will look forward to that. Any other announcements? I am seeing none. Meeting adjourned. Thanks everyone for coming out.

(Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.)

38

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Jerry Anderson

Sam Berman

0313rab.txt

Bob Boggs, EKI
Edward Callahan
Julie Cheever
Dennis Downing
George Ford, Presidio Trust
Matthew Fottler
Julian Hultgren
Doug Kern
Jan Monaghan
Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
Jane Packer, Presidio Trust
Jim Ponton
Kate Pooler
Sharron Reackhof, Presidio Trust
Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
Tracy Wright
Gloria Yaros
Mark Youngkin

---o0o---

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

April 10, 2001

7:10 p.m.

---o0o---

MR. YOUNGKIN: Good evening. Welcome. I am the community co-chair. Doug Kern, our regular facilitator, couldn't make it tonight. So, I will be taking his place. Has everybody had a chance to look over the agenda? Does anybody have any additions, corrections, or subtractions? I am seeing none.

Item 3, announcements and old business. Anybody have any announcements tonight? Any old business? Okay. Item 4, committee reports. Let's hear from Mark Youngkin. Thank you.

We had our regularly scheduled committee meeting on March 27 in Building 1750, the usual place. We discussed -- let's see, the first issue which was discussed was the newspaper article that Julie Cheever is working on. And then we talked about -- Doug Kern brought up a discussion of cyanide sampling, some of the older stuff that was done in '97, or something like that. And the discussion was around the cyanide as missing from the database. So, we had a discussion of that. We had a discussion of background metals. It is an ongoing process

1

♀

to determine background metal numbers. So we had an update

on that.

We had a few membership issues to talk about. George Ford was present. He updated us on the Commissary cleanup. And then we talked about Landfill E for the last few minutes of the meeting. So, our next regular Planning Committee meeting is the fourth Tuesday of this month at Building 1750. Thank you, Mark.

Let's go on. Anybody else have any committee stuff? Okay. We are ready for Item 5, reports and discussions. "A" is the Project Status Update (CERCLA Program).

MR. NELSON: Thank you Mark and Mark. I am going to be talking about most of the usual suspects I discuss on a monthly basis. So, bear with me here. On the Presidio-wide projects we are still dealing with the Contingency Plan and the Presidio-wide Quality Assurance Project Plan. On the Contingency Plan we received comments from the DTSC. And the main concern on the part of that agency was that these contingency sites, as they come up, need to be dealt with by a decision document that is dedicated to those types of sites.

So, what we intend to do is -- we have discussed it with the Trust and the Park Service, and we want to make this decision document a removal action work plan, which will address plugging in contingency sites as they come up.

2

♀
†

So, this would be a plan that looks at conceptually what contingency sites would be like, and the implementability, cost, and effectiveness of remediating them generally by excavating and hauling away the soil.

What we would propose to do is essentially make the
Page 2

former Contingency Plan an implementation plan for this removal action work plan. And we are talking about having an all-hands meeting to discuss this new strategy that is being proposed. And I was thinking the first week of May is looking like a good time. If people have interest, I will send out an e-mail, and we can talk about where this is going to take the Contingency Plan.

MR. BERMAN: Could I ask a quick question here? Is the Contingency Plan meant to be reviewed by DTSC?

MR. NELSON: Yes. What the work plan is going to do is it will provide an opportunity for DTSC to comment. Everybody so far has had an opportunity to comment on the Contingency Plan. We received comments back from Doug in May on behalf of the RAB. And I guess what this process will do is, rather than covering these unknown contamination sites in the Remedial Action Plan for the Main Installation, this its own stand-alone process to go through public meetings, work shops. And a facts sheet, and things like that follows that public participation model. The remedial work plans are similar to an

3

♀

engineering cost analysis for sites that are generally less complicated and less expensive to deal with.

I think in the aggregate, it will be dealing with sites that cost less than a million dollars. So, we hopefully will be dealing with sites that size from the contingency side. Does that answer your question?

MR. BERMAN: So it is like a mini-RAP, basically?

MR. NELSON: Yes, exactly. Right now actually

what is happening is we have received a draft outline from EKI, the consultants working on both the Remedial Action Work Plan and Contingency Plan, and will be working on the Implementation Plan once we have a chance to provide comments on that. We can have the meeting and discuss with all the stakeholders how we are going to go forward with this.

On the Quality Assurance Project Plan, we issued the project to the DTSC. I understand there was someone from the Hazardous Materials Laboratory. And he has been out. So, I understand from talking to Bob Boggs that we will be receiving comments sometime after next week.

MR. BOGGS: Comments are due from HML April 13th, so Friday -- so probably, Monday or Tuesday.

MR. NELSON: So, we hope to have this document approved and out by the end of the month. On the Main Installation FS, we recently received a draft document that

4

♀

was distributed to stakeholders this evening. An announcement was made that the sampling was all for Fill Site 6, which was conducted in late February of this year. I would like to take the opportunity to talk about that investigation and the results in more detail. The RAB subcommittee meeting is in a few weeks, if people are open to that.

Also on Battery Howe Wagner, the plan is to do the trenching and soil sampling on the 18th of April. We have received approval from DTSC. We have not heard any input on that from the Regional Water Board officially. But we did have a conversation with them, and assume we are in

compliance with their wishes.

MR. PONTON: Yes. It is okay.

MR. NELSON: We can talk about that off line.

MS. WRIGHT: Can people come to the trenching?

MR. NELSON: Yes, you can come to the trenching.

It will be like it was at Fill Site 6. You will have to keep a safe distance, and there will be barricades up where you can't access the trenches. But you can observe the activity, and you will have to follow all the safety precautions that our consultant asks you to follow. And I will make an announcement via an e-mail that that is going to be happening.

MR. BERMAN: How long does it take to get your

5

♀

test results after the trenching occurred? Like in Fill Site 6, how long did it actually take?

MR. NELSON: Laboratory results usually take between five and ten working days to get to the consultants. And then they have to put them into a database, and look at them, put them into tables. It gets validated. They post the results on a map and then we collectively, the Trust and MPS, review the information before we release it to the public.

MR. BERMAN: Is there any chance that that could be discussed at the next monthly meeting?

MR. NELSON: Yes. My intention is to discuss that site at the RAB committee meeting. I wanted to talk about it at the --

MR. BERMAN: If the committee meeting is only six

0410rab1.txt
days after the trenching --

MR. NELSON: At Battery Howe Wagner we won't have results by the 24th.

MR. BERMAN: That is why I was asking whether you might present that at the next monthly meeting.

MR. NELSON: Assuming that that data has been approved and reviewed for release, yes, we can talk about it.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it is only two weeks after the trenching, the RAB meeting in May. So, Sam, I

6

♀

think it is unlikely we will have it back at that point.

MR. NELSON: It depends how quickly everything goes. But I would guess that it would probably be either at the RAB committee meeting that same month or at the June RAB meeting.

The background metals, as Mark had mentioned, is coming to a close. We have been working with EKI, DTSC, the Regional Water Board, some of the RAB members, and the Park Service, and a little bit of a sideline comment from EPA on redeveloping some screening and threshold background metals' numbers. And the intention is to have a meeting to discuss how these numbers will be put into the new PYOC and COC screening process. And that meeting will occur on Monday the 16th.

Now, in order to allow people who don't normally come to daytime meetings to also discuss how this is going to be implemented, we can talk about it at the RAB committee meeting at the end of this month.

MR. BERMAN: From the preliminary discussions do
Page 6

you expect serious changes?

MR. NELSON: Some numbers went up; some numbers went down; some numbers didn't change at all, you know. We worked very carefully with all the stakeholders in the process. And we received input from DTSC on which direction we should be taking. And there has been a lot of

7

♀
†

discussion about how these numbers are coming out. A lot of statistics were done to come up with these numbers. And we are hoping that we can reach a consensus on that, so we can move forward and do the screening.

MR. BERMAN: I was just wondering, we had numbers before, and now there has been this discussion. I was wondering whether there is anything that you see so far that is really outstandingly different, like maybe four or five -- not 20 percent, but some sizable factor differently than what was in the originals?

MR. NELSON: There were a few that were. Some were -- frankly, the exposure scenario wasn't even that realistic to do. One that I can think of was chromium was changed to account for X chromium. So the number went down from in the hundreds of thousands for chromium, to the hexavalent, to chromium, things like that. I know Cadmium went down quite a bit. It is quite a low number. So it will be a challenge, when we are excavating, to see how that affects us.

MR. BERMAN: So, the big changes were all in the down direction?

MR. NELSON: I don't know if I want to say that.

There were many numbers that went down a few, and there were a few that went up. We will have an opportunity to talk about that in detail in the afternoon 24th meeting.

8

♀

Then, of course, the plan will be to implement those new numbers into the FS and Removal Action Plan, and Implementation Plan for the contingency sites.

We are also going to have our ARARs and Landfill regulations meeting once the Trust and NPS lawyers meet one last time tomorrow. And we can hopefully issue the outcome of that meeting to determine if the ARARs are going to be used for the FS after the meeting, and after consensus is reached. So, stay tuned for that Landfill regulations' update.

George is going on from here forward.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Item 5, reports and discussions, "B" is Mountain Lake Update by George Ford.

MR. FORD: Actually, I have got one thing to go through before we hit Mountain Lake. And that is the Groundwater Monitoring Program. We expect to get our Revised Field Sampling Plan -- which is also really a template for the entire Groundwater Monitoring Program -- back this week. We made some fairly -- or the consultant has made some fairly extensive changes to it. So we will need to sit down with the Park Service for a few days to make sure that all the changes meet everyone's needs. And we will be sending it off to Bob and Jim. And since it a template for our entire monitoring program, we want to give them more than a half hour to review it.

9

So, but anyhow, we expect to send it. Assuming it comes out all right, we expect to circulate it next week. And we are shooting for sampling at the end of April, or the very early part of May depending on how long it takes to get to a final document with the Water Board and DTSC review. That is where that is.

Now on to Mountain Lake. I am going to go over, in a general way, the results of the sampling, the samples that were taken in January of this year. We took 15 samples from the lake bottom, and three from storm drains on Highway 1. You can read the list of metals: Antimony, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, vanadium, and zinc exceeded the clean-up levels that we have for the Colma formation. Pesticides detected in several locations are pretty evenly distributed around the lake at concentrations that are slightly over the proposed clean-up levels.

If we could go to the next slide, we will show you where the sample are actually taken. There is a bit of a scaling problem on this figure. And you will notice that a few of the sample points appear to be on dry land. They weren't. They were out in the lake. We apologize for that. But you can see these are the 15 sample points that were in the lake. The storm drain sampling points were roughly here, there, and up there on Highway 1.

So, you can see that we tried to get a reasonably even

direction around the surface of the lake. There is a little bit more of a sampling emphasis towards the west side, but we did cover it all the way around. Next slide.

The main metals that we see in the highest concentrations above their cleanup levels are lead, zinc, and cadmium. By looking at this slide you can tell that some of the concentrations we saw were quite high. The lead and zinc sample are both respectively more than 10 times higher than the proposed clean-up levels. Those two samples actually came out of the drop inlets on the highway. So, they were not taken in the lake.

The lake concentrations, the samples that came from sediments in the lake, are somewhat lower. But, for instance, we do have an occurrence of at least a thousand parts per million lead within the lake. So, these numbers are the highest ones we see. But there are concentrations within the upper lake sediments that substantially exceed the proposed cleanup levels. The cadmium sample did actually come out of the lake. You can see that is about 10 times over the proposed cleanup level.

Oh, we were changing the cadmium. These hot samples all came out of the drop inlets. There are exceedances of all of these metals within the lake sediments. They are lower than these numbers, but they are still subtly above

11

♀

the clean-up levels. In a nutshell, it looks like inland sediments, roughly the upper 4 feet along the western half of the lake, will probably require some cleanup. Now, the exact area of cleanup and the depth to which you would have to perform a remediation is still being discussed. And it

will probably take some time to finalize that, you know. It really depends on -- you have to look at the pattern of exceedances, and decide what your primary focus is going to be. But we are still working on that.

MR. BERMAN: George, technical question, how deep was the lake sediments sampling?

MR. FORD: We went to, I believe, 10 feet below the sediment water interface. Most of the action is in the upper 4 feet. In fact, the vast majority of the high metal concentrations are in the upper 2 feet.

MR. BERMAN: So, you have already information as to how the concentrations change with depth?

MR. FORD: Yes, we do.

MR. BERMAN: So, you feel comfortable with the 4 feet as sort of the a good boundary, or maybe less than that, in some cases?

MR. FORD: It will be less than that in some cases. But if you were trying to do a back-of-the-envelope view, if you took out the upper 4 feet, that would get the vast majority of it. So, that is really the kind of level

12

♀

of analysis we have gotten so far.

MR. BERMAN: Do you have sort of a ballpark number of what that volume of the material would be?

MR. FORD: In fact, if we go to the next slide, we can talk about that.

MR. ANDERSON: Back on the other slide, you said that those high metal measurements were in a drain. Is this in the outwash drain, or in a horizontal drain, or in

a catch basin.

MR. FORD: In the drop inlets that are on the road edge.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Either in the inlet or right next to the drop inlet. So, you would get it through the drain samples created in near the sediments, near the outfall.

MR. ANDERSON: Is the outfall at the top of the bank?

MR. ULLENSVANG: Under water, I believe. I am not sure where that physical outfall is, but the sediment samples in the lake near the outfalls were under water.

MR. FORD: I thought this one was going to be a picture, but generally speaking, you can say that the pattern of occurrence suggests that some of the metals probably came from Highway 1. Some of the other elevated metals may be the results of the fact that we have Serpentine upland, and there are Serpentine derived

13

♀

sediments down at the lake.

This is another the simplified view of where we think the action is. The Mountain Lake Enhancement Project we have highlighted in green. You can't see it here, but this would actually extend along this line. This is what they were originally proposing to dredge for the enhancement project. The total volume for that dredging has been estimated to be about 11,500 cubic yards. What we have shown in pink here is the area. Again, this is very approximate because we sometimes have the same scaling problem with this figure. But in an approximate way, this shows where we have most of the elevated metal

concentrations.

If you take this area and, you know, assume a roaming excavation depth of something like 4 feet, the volume, the remedial volume, coming out of the pink area would be about 8,500 cubic yards by itself. Now, in the two areas there is substantial overlap between the enhancement dredging area and a hypothetical clean-up dredging area. If you just calculate the volume looking at the entire perimeter, taking both the enhancement dredging, the remedial dredging, the volume you are looking at is around 15,000 cubic yards.

So, those are the kinds of volumes we are talking about. Now, I should point out that this border -- kind of

14

♀

the eastern edge of the remediation area -- is very approximate. We are really just drawing this in here. We don't have a lot of control in here. It is possible that the border would need to be extended this way. And as we finish doing the analysis, the shape of this thing may change. But, in a general way, I think that is what we are looking at.

MR. BERMAN: Could I ask a silly question? If the funds were given to the Trust to clean up what the Army left behind, and the toxicity in this lake is essentially associated with run off from Highway 1, why isn't Cal Trans contributing to this cleanup?

MR. FORD: Well, that is not a silly question at all. We are still looking into that. The Trust -- I would say that right now the Trust is of the opinion that the

responsibility for the cleanup rests with either the Army or Cal Trans, and not with the Trust. That this is a cleanup that should not have to be funded out of the Trust's existing remedial pocket. But, again, that is just our thinking right now. I mean, one of the reasons it is taking a while for this, the draft report to come out, is that everybody is looking at this saying, "Gee, there is likely to be some disagreement about who is responsible to pay for all this."

And so, we want to make sure that when the report comes

15

♀

out, it is as solid as we can get it, so that later on if the Trust does elect to make a claim against Cal Trans, or the Army, however that might work out, that the document that we are basing the claim or the assertions on is a good one. So, we are looking down the road. Nothing is final yet, but we are looking down the road. And our opinion right now is that one of these other agencies should be responsible for this.

MR. BERMAN: It seems to make sense. But is there any reason to have early discussions with them about this?

MR. FORD: We have been having a lot of debate about that within the Trust recently. And, basically, it boils down to two factions. One is that we should, if we think we have a claim against the Army or Cal Trans, give them a heads-up right away. But the faction that is winning right now, I would say, is the other one, which says, "Gee, if you send them a letter saying, 'Hey, we need a lot of your money,' but you don't give them any back up, you haven't really accomplished anything."

So where we are going right now is we want to get the draft report prepared in such a way that we are very comfortable with it, and we think it is as bulletproof as we can make it. And then, if we are going to make a claim, we will put a claim letter on top of the report, and send them both together, and say, "We think we have a problem

16

♀
†

here. We think you should pay. And here is the data that supports our position now." As it takes more time to finalize that report, we may get uncomfortable, and the other side we may conclude it makes more sense to just write a letter that gives them a heads up that we think we have issues here.

MR. BERMAN: Well, the one advantage with the heads-up approach is, presumably, if the agency felt that there was any potential responsibility, they would send a technical person into to look over your shoulder in some sense, or to work with you, so that when the final report came, it wasn't just a blindside.

MR. FORD: Well, they will get a chance to do that because the report that we are doing to circulate will be a draft. And it, most likely, will change a little bit between the draft and final. But, you know, this is the kind of thing where we -- I think we have to be very careful. We don't want them looking over our shoulder too early in the process because, obviously, anybody that we might want to make a claim against has got a vested interest in muddying the water, so to speak, and making it more difficult for us to assert our claims.

So, I think right now is not the time to invite them to look over our shoulder. But the report is going to go out as a draft. They will be able to review it. So, I think

17

♀

there will be time for that.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Can you help us understand why the previous samplings didn't come up with this, or find it? I mean, we have been sampling here since 1906, or even before I believe.

MR. FORD: Yes. I will need Brian or Sharron to jump in once I go off the rails. But the Army sampling was fairly limited. I think they only took three or four sampling points. And the fact may be that they just missed it. When you take a small number of samples in a relatively large area, sometimes you hit it, sometimes you don't. I know that the sampling -- some were more extensive samplings that EKI did on behalf of the Trust about two years ago. That was done with the specific purpose of trying to characterize most of the sediment for disposal. They were essentially looking at it with the thinking, "We are going to dredge out 11,500 cubic yards. Can it be dried out and used as potting soil, or do we have to put it in a landfill?"

So, the sampling that EKI did they did, composite sampling, where they took a 6, or 8, or 10-foot core, and then they would take a little from several intervals in the cores, mix them all up, and analyze the pile that they had; that is the right way to sample if you are trying to find out the bulk characteristics of a very large quantity of

18

♀

soil. And that is really what their marching orders were, to try to characterize the sediment for disposal. And it is kind of an averaging technique.

So, one of the drawbacks is that if you have got a 10-foot stick of core, and you take 10 thimblefuls, the top could be 1,000 parts per million, and the other nine could be zero. And you come out with an average of 100 over the whole core. Which, in a sense it is an accurate average, but it misrepresents it. It doesn't tell you anything about the direction. That is the kind of sampling that EKI did. It was the right thing to do for their marching orders.

But basically what happened here is when the Burn and Ready (sic) data came out, I think everybody looked at that and said, "This isn't really environmental data that we could directly compare any other results to their results with." But the problem is, they had some lead levels that were so high that even if you make rule-of-thumb corrections to allow for their different methods, their numbers were still a lot higher than anything else that had been seen.

So, after that data came out, it kind of raised the red flag that maybe something had been missed here. So, then we came back and did this study. Again, in comparison I think the Burn and Ready data -- they had some

19

♀

concentrations as high as about 5,000 parts per million in

the lake sediments, if I remember right. We are now seeing about a 1,000, or between a 1,000, and 2,000 parts per million lead in the lake sediments. So, I mean essentially the Burn and Ready data was kind of a red flag waving. And it turns out it was an indicator of something that had been missed.

MR. ANDERSON: Has there always been 4 feet of soil sampling in that area?

MR. FORD: That is one of the things that is still being looked at. I know that Burn and Ready, they were doing a bunch of follow-up studies to try to figure out what depth of the sediment corresponds to what age. And I don't really know how reliable --

MR. ANDERSON: If you have to take out 15,000 cubic yards --

MR. FORD: If you take 15,000 cubic yards, it wouldn't be a constant depth 4 feet.

MR. ANDERSON: Would these metals leach their ways down into the sediment?

MR. FORD: No. See, we do have some depth sampling data. And although I haven't looked --

MR. ANDERSON: If it got as low as 4 feet, does that mean it was contaminated when sediment was laid in there?

MR. FORD: I don't know. Maybe we could resolve that if we took --

MR. ULLENSVANG: There is a fair amount of work for the restoration process of looking at the sedimentation history of the leak. That is one of the problems. It is

the health of the lake -- is that it has become very shallow. I can't tell you the right numbers of the studies about how the lake much of that filling in is a natural process of a lake. But of much of it is greatly against Park Presidio Boulevard and other recent activities.

And so, the restoration process is to remove some of its recent sediments to return to more along the lines of what it would naturally be, and to become more of a healthy lake. So, there is some idea of what the lake bottom has done, and what the sedimentation rates have been over time about the metals.

MR. ANDERSON: I just wondered, if you said the levels were the highest on the surface and they tapered off down below -- so, if they stay where the silt is, then that means that there was less contamination earlier on. And they got greater concentrations as they went down. Does the stuff on the surface gradually drift down?

MR. ULLENSVANG: From the data that I have seen, it appears that it is not leaching or drifting through the sediment as much as probably a depositional history. And

21

♀

much of the sedimentation probably occurred during the construction of the road in the late 30s, or following, which would be about the same time that automobile traffic would occur in that area. So, it seems to be consistent with a depositional history as opposed to migration with the soil top.

MR. ANDERSON: Just seems like if it is 4-feet deep over that large an area it would be undermining the

highway in it if it actually came from there.

MR. ULLENSVANG: George is simplifying what is going on there. And it is not a uniform 4-foot depth. And that is part of what makes it not as easy to try to say what is going on in. In some cases it is a very shallow depth, a foot or less. And so, part of what the report needs to do is help people visualize how the contamination sits in that lake bottom.

MR. FORD: The next step is we need to have a decision document to do a cleanup. We have got to analyze alternatives, and write those down, and put them in a document there, and finalize it. Our thinking, at the moment -- and I think our thinking will continue this way -- is that we are going to do that as part of the Main Installation FS. The FS is going on now. We can bring Mountain Lake into it, and work on it, evaluate alternatives over the course of this year.

22

♀

Kind of an approximate time line on these bullets here, it seems likely we would spend the balance of this year finalizing the FS, and working on plans and specifications for remedial dredging. If that is, in fact, what is going to be done, that would put us on schedule to do the bidding, and select the contractor in the first quarter of 2002. And then you would perform the actual cleanup in the summer of 2002. So, in kind of broad strokes, that is what we are thinking about, the schedule right now.

This has the advantage of it doesn't -- the Mountain Lake study can be pulled in and made part of the Main Installation FS fairly easily. It is not another separate

report we have to put together. So, to us it seems like this is a fairly efficient way to deal with it. And it ends up with a clean-up schedule that is compatible with the restoration project.

MS. POOLE: If the contamination is coming from the road, what would you do to prevent future contamination?

MR. FORD: That is a good question. I know that part of any remediation the storm drains, which now seem to contain a fair amount of contaminated sediments, would have to be cleaned out. The next issue is, is there a lot of lead-bearing particles still up on the roadway? Common sense tells me there shouldn't be just because leaded gas

23

♀

has been -- I mean, I don't know how many years it has been since they sold leaded gas, but it has been a few years. But at this time we don't have any data about if this is a continuing source of lead particles washing down off of the roadway.

MS. POOLE: Would the zinc and cadmium be coming from leaded gasoline as well?

MR. FORD: No. I think it is possible that the zinc and cadmium could be the result of tires.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. Zinc and cadmium are impurities on tires. So, they could be coming from there. They may be a continuing source from the roadway. In that situation, if further analysis shows that might be a problem, one way to address it would be to divert the drains out of the lake, or to add some sort of feature on

the drains that would collect it before they discharge in a sediment trap, or something like that. There are ways it could be addressed in the FS or design document to address and prevent a reoccurrence if that shows it is a possible source.

MR. BERMAN: Isn't that clearly a cost that should be borne by Cal Trans?

MR. FORD: We sure think so.

MR. NELSON: Under State laws they are required to deal with their own stormwater drains. So, we could

24

♀

fashion something to make sure they maintain that. We hope to, at least.

MR. FORD: I think one of the things that will occur over the rest of this year is there will be negotiations between the Trust and the Park Service on negotiating with the Army and/or Cal Trans. I know that the regulatory agencies will be involved in those discussions to try to establish, before we get to the stage of doing a cleanup, who is paying for what. We will try to keep you posted on how those go.

MR. YOUNGKIN: If this was not part of the FS, what agency would the cleanup be through, or what process would it go through? Do you know what I am saying?

MR. FORD: That is a good question. I don't know the answer. I believe the Water Board would be involved, you know, just because it is the State.

MR. BOGGS: You could say Cal EPA, which includes DTSC and the Water Board.

MR. YOUNGKIN: So Cal Trans' stormwater program is

through Cal EPA?

MR. PONTON: I will go check into that I. Don't know. I never really looked at it. I don't know.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Before you put it into the FS, maybe you want to look into the alternative that you will be looking for money from these people.

25

♀
†

MR. FORD: I think those kinds of issues will definitely be looked into. But, I think, part of the Trust's view of it right now is that, you know, there is likely to be some squabbling about the money. And the Trust is committed to moving on the cleanup. And so, we want to do it in such a way that the money squabbling can occur over here, and not have that cause the design of the cleanup to stop dead in its tracks.

So, I mean, I think those kinds of things are going to be discussed, but I think we want to be careful about putting ourselves in a position where we are waiting for approval or concurrence from either the Army or Cal Trans, you know, before we, at least, go with a design because that kind of scenario might take forever. If we are looking for positive feedback from another agency that we have just told they need to send us a check for hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars, it may take a long time to get a positive answer to that kind of question.

Next is Graded Area 9. Last month when I was much younger I came before you with great enthusiasm to tell you that we were going to go buy a whole lot of sand and build some dunes at Graded Area 9. Well, turns out I was young

and foolish then, and here is the situation. As we said last month, the Golden Gate Park sand is not available to us anymore. They have decided they need all they have got.

26

♀

They won't give, or sell, or let us take any extra.

A number of stakeholders have expressed some concern about, you know -- with the deal changing like that. We went pretty quickly from free sand to buying \$300,000 or \$400,000 worth of sand, you know. The deal changed, and some of the stakeholders were wondering why is this thing still on a fast track because that is a substantial change in the deal. And while, when it seemed like we could save a whole lot of money with this free sand, that seemed to be a reasonable justification to move the project to the front of the line, because otherwise Graded Area 9 would not get to the front of the line. But when the deal changes, and all of a sudden you have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars, the justification for moving it to the front of the line isn't there anymore.

So, we have been seeing some discomfort on the part of stakeholders. These first two factors have sort of had their effect within the Trust in that now the Trust enthusiasm to spend a few hundred thousand dollars on a vegetation restoration, in an area where the stakeholders are feeling a little nervous about accelerating this thing -- the Trust's enthusiasm about making that money available has diminished. So, where we are right now is we are back to, essentially, the original proposal, which is that this thing -- we are not going to run out and

27

♀

buy 60,000 cubic yards of sand and dump it there all at once. We are going to try to keep our eyes peeled for some sand that meets the specs. And if we can get it for free or very low cost, we will take it. But the project as a hurry-up basis to buy all this sand and get it there in one fell swoop, is on hold for now.

MS. YAROS: What about the sand that someone thought would be available from the Monterey dunes?

MR. FORD: It is available. And it is about \$28 a cubic yard to buy, and another \$14 or \$15 a cubic yard to get it here. So, I mean, that is beautiful sand, and it meets every specification because it is actually taken out of dunes in Seaside, I think. But it costs \$40 plus, a cubic yard to get it up here. And I don't want to do the math in my head, but if you need 16,000 yards, and you have to pay \$40 a yard, I think that is about a half a million dollars worth of sand.

And that is really part of the trouble, that it is -- suddenly the sand that we hoped to kind of collect over time at low cost -- we were looking at spending \$500,000 dollars to get it here in one fell swoop. I know it is not a very satisfying answer, but it is a combination of factors that made us realize that this project should not be on the front burner anymore. We should slow down with it, and go back to the original proposal we made.

28

♀

MS. YAROS: And the \$40, that was bringing it by

truck, on the open road?

MR. FORD: Truck, yes. And I would love to have a pier to unload barges here at the Presidio, because for a site like that we could cut our transportation costs substantially. But we don't have the pier. My guess is it would cost millions of dollars to do the permitting to build one. And so really for something like that in the short term, if we want the sand this year, we would have no choice but to bring it up in trucks. And so, that is how we costed it out.

MS. YAROS: You aren't comparing the 5,000 to a half million now that it looks like it might take a while? I mean, they are so far apart.

MR. FORD: The original deal that we thought we had was that we could get the Golden Gate Park sand for free, and we would have to pay to haul it here. But since it is only 5 miles away, we can get it here relatively cheaply. So, I mean, I think we are looking at maybe \$3 or \$4 a yard to load it up, truck it, and dump it. So, our total cost would be \$3 or \$4 a yard for that sand. But when you look at buying it, you have to pay for the sand, and pay for the transportation. That pretty quickly, with almost any sand source, gets you up in the range of, say, \$25 to \$35 per cubic yard for the sand. And this nice sand

29

♀
†

from Monterey happened to be the most expensive, mostly because it is so far away.

Any other questions about Graded Area 9? I know we have another project. The Commissary, after a year of talking about it we finally got to dig the hole. So, we

have been doing some work down at the Commissary. And the phase 1, which is the cleanup of the Commissary's northwest parking lot, is now done. And, in fact, I believe the contractor is scheduled to put in indicators for the detour where we will eventually detour traffic through the parking lot tomorrow.

The other development is the phase 2. And I don't know if we talked about this last month, but phase 2, which is the cleanup under Mason Street, we have postponed to May 8, which is after the Crissy Field public opening ceremonies, which occur April 30th to May 6th. We basically concluded that no matter how we did it, we couldn't avoid having a huge crater sitting where the road used to be during the middle of the Crissy field opening celebration. And while I thought that was fine, the Park Service and a few people from the Trust had a different view of it. So, we have decided safely to do postpone phase 2.

I have a few pictures to show you. This is the Commissary looking east. You can see this is the northwest

30

♀

parking lot, and this is the project when they were just getting it started. They put the K-rails up there. The official reason is traffic control. I can tell you that probably the real reason is to ward off muni-buses, which drive through there at about 50 miles an hour. We don't want any of them to miscalculate and end up in our excavation. So, that is why these, for those of you who aren't in construction, big concrete barriers are called

K-rails.

This is a view after the contractor had been working for a little while. This is taken -- we have some big water tanks out there. We were pumping water out of the excavation. That shot was taken standing on top of the water tank. You can see they are digging here. The picture is probably not good enough, but they are on bay mud. The bottom of the hole has water on top of it. Then there is about 3 feet of sand, which you can see right there. And then there is fill on top of it.

At this site the sand is where most of the contamination was. The spill, we think, actually occurred back in the area where this excavator is sitting. It spilled down vertically, got into the sand, and spread out. This is some of the digging. This is a storm drain pipe that went through the excavation. This guy is straddling a telephone conduit that you will see in another picture.

31

♀

This is what it looked like after they had dug some more. The white pipe that you saw in the last one, they cut off. So, you can't see it in this picture. And this is the telephone conduit. They essentially exposed it by hand digging. And they supported it on these sticks to keep it up out of the water. Again, this is the bottom of the excavation, all bay mud. This is another view looking back towards the east. You can see the fill is sand that was put in for the Panama Pacific Exhibition. This is bay mud. On top is fill that was placed sometime after the Panama Pacific Exhibition.

Here is another view of when they had done some more

digging. This is right after they cut the storm drain off. We found some interesting things in here. There was actually a storm drain that came out from under the Commissary that was quite deep. It was almost 7 feet below the ground surface. That was an old clay, storm drain pipe.

When the excavator broke through, we had a gusher of black oil that came out of that drain. And, of course, we thought that was very interesting. And we had to mop it all up to make sure we didn't pump it out into the sanitary sewer. Then we had a Trust crew come down and use their equipment to clean out the storm drain, and run a camera up it to try to see where it went to see if the oil that was

32

♀

in the pipe sort of came from this spill here, or could it have come from some place else, and actually been the cause of this spill. It seems like the pipe is cut off or broken off back at the Commissary. And we think it is cleaner at the upstream end.

So, right now our conclusion is that the spill probably occurred right here, and that the oil leaked from this spill area into the clay pipe. So when we broke through it all we did was release the accumulated contamination. The clay pipe continues on under Mason Street and heads out towards the Marsh. So, as we get into phase 2, that is something that we will be looking at. We will be removing the pipe as we go, and cleaning it out. If we have to leave any of it in place, up the marsh bank, we will clean it out and grout it out. But all kinds of treasures were

0410rab1.txt
found under the ground there.

And the other news is we have been doing closure sampling as we go along. As far as we can tell -- and the results are preliminary -- we got it all. As we dig down to the bay mud, we are getting non-detect for gasoline, diesel, motor oil, and PAHs. And lead numbers appear to be typical for background. So, it does look like the cleanup has been effective. This is just another view of the hole.

The 1065 cap update, this is another petroleum site. We now have the Harding Lawson proposal we were expecting.

33

♀

And we are in the process of reviewing it. We may ask them to make some revisions before we authorize it. We are still on schedule for a Fall 2001 cleanup. What will happen between now and then is we will prepare an updated Corrective Action Plan, and it will come out as a draft. So, everybody will have a chance to review it. We may also be discussing some of the conclusions, or proposed remedies either at this meeting, or one of the working group meetings that people have a chance to discuss what they think should be done.

MS. CHEEVER: Where is it?

MR. FORD: Yes. Well, I could take you there. It is where Gerard -- I don't know the streets. That is terrible.

MR. NELSON: You know where there is parking on the north end sloping down? If you were to go to that road that is perpendicular to the parking lot -- the building was actually torn down -- it is on the other side of that road. It is in the Major Letterman Complex, and it is

pretty close to Fill Site 6. So just north of Fill Site 6, and on this side of Corrigus, which is a street that runs sort of off of Mason there. There are warehouses in between.

MS. CHEEVER: Why was it a petroleum site?

MR. FORD: The Army actually had some underground

34

♀
†

tanks there, and gas pumps actually at several locations right around building 1065. It looks like 1065, which was sort of a fueling station and vehicle shed, was the main location. But there were also a number of other small tank sites right in the area. And part of what we are hoping to do is kind of collect all those sites together and deal with them in one corrective action. Sounds to me like we should maybe have a site Tour for people. And then we can show you what is there, and I can learn the names of the streets, so I will officially know where it is.

MR. BERMAN: Was any of this fuel ever used in the electricity generation?

MR. FORD: I don't know.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know if they were making electricity, but it was a steam plant there, one of the buildings. And I don't know if they made anything other than steam.

MR. BERMAN: So, did they use the fuel to make the steam also?

MR. ULLENSVANG: That was part of the FDS steam plant.

MR. BERMAN: So, that whole area has been

0410rab1.txt
inspected for petroleum?

MR. ULLENSVANG: Quite a bit. There has been a number of distinct investigations. What George was saying

35

♀

is this cap will bring them together and look at a more wholistic way of covering this area, and to try to address all of these little discretely investigated sites into one comprehensive plant.

MR. BERMAN: So, is the steam generator still functioning?

MR. ULLENSVANG: The tank has been removed, and the fuel source -- the petroleum fuel source -- has been removed. I don't know what equipment is left.

MR. FORD: I don't think we are now generating steam. No, we have given up steam because electricity is cheap and plentiful. So, it is a lot better to use that.

MR. BERMAN: Is there a plan for using that in those buildings? They are all pretty hideous if you just look at them.

MR. FORD: Yes, but I think most of them were considered historic in some fashion, though. So, I mean, I assume that there will be a plan to reuse them although I don't think they are on the top of the Trust's interim leasing program. Partly because of those industrial-use-type buildings are a lot tougher to clean them up, and get them ready for a new tenant. But one of the things that the corrective action will have to deal with are the historic buildings. We know we have fuel extending to some historic buildings. So we have to

36

♀

decide, do we go under there and get it, or is it better to leave it in place and monitor it. So, those are some of the decisions that have to be made.

MR. BERMAN: Was the clay drain pipe -- that you mentioned in the previous slide -- essentially all the way from under the parking lot, all the way into Crissy Field pond?

MR. FORD: I think it is, although we haven't gotten there yet. And one of the reasons is we felt comfortable using a jet cleaner going back upstream away from the marsh, because anything that came out we could catch in the pit. We don't want to jet it going towards the marsh. If we break through, there is oil in there, and we would wash out into the marsh. What we want to do is, when we take out the road -- there is about another 40 feet that we can manually remove that pipe. So, that is what we will take out, that 40 feet, and sort of look at the stuff, and see what it looks like. It may be packed with sand.

MR. BERMAN: Is there any possibility that that was really the origin of the contamination of the marsh, and it really wasn't coming from this sand?

MR. FORD: No. I don't think so, because the other thing we did find, that I didn't mention, was that there was an area just underneath where the excavator was sitting. In one of the first photographs I showed where

37

♀

the soil contamination extended up to the surface, really.

You know, right up to the most recent base rock that was put under the modern pavement. So, I have seen that happen a lot. And that was the spill area. I mean, we don't know what spilled, but we know roughly where the spill occurred.

So, I don't think -- my thinking right now is one of the places is very deep, the storm drain, considering where it is. And, you know, the marsh wasn't always there. The storm drain had to drain out to the bay. Well, it is almost 7 feet below ground surface at the Commissary. The Commissary is still something like 800 feet away from the margin of the bay. So, it may have been like a storm drain that was designed that came down the hill, and was designed to operate under pressure to, basically, only drain out into the bay. When water backed up the hill high enough, the pipe would force it out this extra 700 or 800 feet out to the bay.

But right now that is my theory. It is puzzling how deep this pipe is considering where it is.

MR. BERMAN: But if it was intricate, how did the spill actually enter the pipe?

MR. FORD: I have to think about that. I mean, I don't know. The pipe has not been operational for a long time. I am expecting, as we get closer towards the marsh, we will see it is filled up with sand that may have washed

38

♀
†

in from the bay. So, I don't know. The one thing I do know is that this thing was full of oil. And to the extent that we can probe it, it appears to get cleaner as we go upstream towards the hill. But, you know, the mechanics of it, we are still trying to figure out.

MR. BERMAN: I just thought it was puzzling that it was really an intricate -- as a structure it was intricate. How did anything get into it from this spill area?

MR. FORD: I don't know if it was. We may yet find it has holes in it, or missing sections that we will have to look at as we tear it out.

MR. BERMAN: But so far what you have seen is it isn't porous?

MR. FORD: Right. So, if, in fact, where the segment broke it appeared to be under some head. Because when they broke it, the reports were that the oil came shooting out. It didn't drip out. It was a good horizontal flow. I don't know, but we will be thinking about that. And, I guess, next month -- I don't know if we will have made any progress. I hope as we expose more of the pipe, we will be able to figure out more what went on.

Okay. The mini-caps and tank removals -- we had a site walk with Geo Resources, who is a consultant we have asked to help us kind of kickstart this program, and our

39

♀

regulators came around. And we looked at a couple of mini sites. We are working on the documentation for the first nine mini-cap sites, which are places where the Army removed tanks, mostly in the big, historic buildings that are on the northwest side of the Parade Grounds.

Buildings 100 through 105, those are the first nine that we are going to tackle. And in the ensuing months we will be putting these things together in batches of roughly

0410rab1.txt
10, and doing more of them.

And then this last item should be dear to somebody's heart, because it is partly in response to your asking about it. We are working on a Petroleum Program Plan, which will describe what we want to do and the approximate order that we intend to attack things. And it is also going to include a listing of our known petroleum sites, so that you can essentially keep it as a check list. And it will help us keep track of what we are doing, and certainly help you keep track of what we are doing. We expect to have -- we are going to circulate that as a draft. So, people can comment often. We expected to have the draft ready the middle of next month. So, if anybody has any thoughts on that before it comes out, feel free to give me a call, or an email because we are still writing it. So, it is possible that we would consider it.

I think that is the skeet range. We are looking at

40

♀

doing the cleanup in May or June when we have favorable conditions. Recently some wild life protection issues have arisen, which may affect the schedule. If we have nesting birds endangered, or protect birds right out in the area that we are supposed to dig, we won't dig until the birds are gone. We are looking into that right now. So, it is not definite. So, there is a possibility we may need to postpone the cleanup to a time when we are free of birds. I have offered to get rid of the birds. I make these great suggestions and the Park Service and the Trust, they don't like any of them.

And then Crissy Field Closure Sampling Plan -- I hoped

to circulate it tonight, but didn't get that done. But it will be put in the mail tomorrow. So, that is something that will come around. And we can all take a look at it, and you can provide your comments on it. It is designed to address some groundwater issues in the west bluff area, and do closure sampling in the actual tidal marsh, which used to be Fill Site 7.

MR. MILLER: What kind of birds are endangered or protected?

MR. FORD: They are Killdeer. What I have heard so far is that there may be Killdeer nesting in the dunes.

MR. MILLER: My other question is about the

41

♀

Commissary cleanup. Is that one of those that you tried to do, or was that done with the consultant, or with the Trust?

MR. FORD: We have contracted it out. The contractor is doing it. The work is being done by Performance Excavators out of San Rafael. And we did have Treadwell and Rollo actually do the Remedial Design document, such as it was, for us. So, no, it is not a Trust in-house project.

MR. MILLER: This presentation is a good visual. I am seeing how large the holes are. How much of a cost is involved?

MR. FORD: We had estimated about \$450,000. The original bid for the work was \$424,000, and there have been some extras. And I am guessing that it is going to finish

0410rab1.txt
in the range of \$500,000 to \$550,000.

MR. MILLER: Is most of that for disposal costs?

MR. FORD: The two biggest costs are disposal and restoration of Mason Street. The actual volume of soil we are taking out is not that large, but there is a lot of replacing of drains, and paving, and stuff like that. That makes it fairly expensive.

The pilot study, which we had talked about on and off for a couple of those details, are firming up. The preferred sites from the Trust and the Park Service points

42

♀

of view are Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. As you may or may not know, these are up on top of Rob Hill in the area off Washington Boulevard. Landfill 4 is next to Central Magazine, south of the World War II memorial.

One of the reasons we picked these sites is Landfill 4 is an Area B site. Under the Trust's jurisdiction Fill Site 5 is actually in Area B, but it is within a 100 feet of the border of Area A, which means that it is effectively an Area B site. So, we have got one Trust site and one Park Service site. They are both sites that were scheduled for clean closure with the MOA. They are not too big. They are relatively well hidden. It is not in the middle of a heavily used, sort of, public area.

The Trust is now collecting proposals to prepare the work plan. And we see the work plan as being the primary document by which this study would be authorized. We will send it out as a draft with everybody's comments. And when and if DTSC approves the work plan, that would be our authorization to go ahead and do it.

We are still targeting start of fieldwork in October of 2001. The thinking is that the Trust would use its own forces to do the clean closure of Landfill 4, which is the slightly smaller site. And that we would contract out clean closure of Fill Site 5, which is slightly bigger. We don't know exactly how big it is. And that is one of the

43

♀
†

issues that we are hoping to address in this study, as to who is the better estimator of landfill volumes. And we expect to clear the fill work by the end of 2001, so that the report and the Treatability Study can be integrated into the FS or the RAB, either as a chapter in the document, or as an appendix.

Any questions about the Treatability Study? Community Relations Plan.

MR. MILLER: I was going to ask about the Commissary. What kind of volume was that? How much soil was removed?

MR. FORD: So far we have taken out about 900 cubic yards for disposal. And that is less than half the actual -- I think it will be more like 1,300 yards that we expect to come out from beneath Mason Street. That is assuming that it looks like the excavation boundaries that we drew in the design drawings were pretty good. We went a little bit over, but not much. And so, if the second phase goes without a lot of extra excavation, it should be about another 1,300 yards.

MS. PACKER: Briefly, the comments from the RAB on the Community Relations Plan have been received, and we

are in the process of developing the final draft. And the other announcement is I want to make sure everyone knows that next month's meeting in May will be held at the Log

44

♀

Cabin. I am also sending out a letter to everyone as a reminder to make a note of that, that May -- I think it is the 10th -- but next month's meeting -- okay, it is May 8th. But I wanted to let you know the Trust received the comments from the RAB, and currently is preparing the final draft.

MS. POOLE: There will be signs as to how to get there?

MS. PACKER: Yes, and I will -- within the letter there will be directions and everything.

MR. NELSON: It is a log cabin, and it is colder than this.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. And now we are on to Agenda Item 8, Regulatory Agency Status Updates and Input.

MR. BOGGS: Well, I think the other folks have told you a little bit of what we have been doing -- reviewing, and approving, and writing letters. Things that we have immediately on our plate right now, that we are waiting for right now, is the groundwater monitoring, we are also working with the Trust on the Treatability Study, and getting that approved. We have a draft letter for them on that. And we are also just trying to help the whole process along with Mountain Lake and the Graded Area 9 sand.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Bob.

45

♀

MR. BERMAN: Do you have any comment on the Pilot Study procedure?

MR. BOGGS: I had the meeting with management yesterday afternoon because we prepared, basically, a letter of approval for the primary plan at this point to go ahead with the Treatability Study. There were one or two issues we still have a little concern about that we want to talk with people about. Specifically, the cleanup levels, and how those are going to be adapted. We requested the Trust use conservative cleanup levels, but those cleanup levels haven't been finalized per the FS process. So, there is a little risk there to do this Treatability Study if we come back with the FS, and we have lower cleanup levels, and to go back and do additional work to restore hill sides, and that kind of thing. There are a few potential risks, and we want to minimize those risks. And we think we can. So, we think it is a very good idea. We think it is going to generate a lot of good information.

One of our concerns was also that it was done in the public purview so you guys have a chance to review the plan that is being proposed. They really are pursuing clean closure. So to that extent, we are in support of any project that does result in clean closure.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. Bob. Jim, anything?

MR. PONTON: No.

46

♀

MR. YOUNGKIN: New business? Any new business

anybody wants to bring up? How about review of action items? I think that ties in with agenda items for the upcoming committee meeting and RAB meeting. We will talk about background metals at the committee meeting. We have trenching and sampling at Battery Howe Wagner on April 18th. Anything else?

MR. BERMAN: Will there be a summary of what was concluded with the ARARs?

MR. NELSON: By the next committee meeting? I don't think so.

MR. YOUNGKIN: But there will be a meeting to discuss it?

MR. NELSON: Yes, there will be a meeting that all the stakeholders will be invited to to talk about the ARARs, as we have mentioned. Also, I forgot to mention this before. I know there has been some considerable interest recently in the database and chemical screening process we have gone through. I think I recall we talked about it at a RAB meeting, but it was probably quite a few months ago. And a lot has happened since then, including some potential changes to proposed cleanup numbers, and potential changes to proposed screening and threshold numbers for background metals.

So, I would like to propose that we have EKI come in

47

♀
†

and talk at great length about the chemical screening process that we are going through. And it actually is going to be redone -- essentially, the redevelopment of these new numbers. So, I guess, I would propose to do it at the May 8th RAB meeting because our plate is already

pretty full for the committee meeting with Fill Site 6 and the background metals. So, do people have interest in that? I know there have been questions about PCBs and cyanide.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other agenda items you would like to add, talk to Sharron or myself. Anything else this evening?

MS. CHEEVER: I wanted to ask, it seems like just from tonight's presentation alone, there are some documents coming up -- for instance, the 1065 Draft Program Plan, and some other things a little later. I know there are ongoing documents about groundwater sampling, especially the ones that are for review. Would we all get a copy of them, or alerts that it is available, or what?

MR. NELSON: We have been trying to put out notices that documents are available. In fact, I sent out an e-mail, based on your request last time, for Fill Site 6. I did literally get it today, and so I sent out the e-mail. If you would like your own copy for Fill Site 6, I would be glad to get you one.

48

♀

Another thing I have been working on recently is to try to get some of our documents, and a lot of our announcements, onto a web site that is run through the Presidio Trust. We have a slightly archaic system. I think there is a picture of a flower and a little bit of text. So, I am working with some consultants on some proposals to get our web site into the 21st century, and talking about remediation, and allowing for announcements,

and maybe have a place where people can provide comments or feedback. There are all sorts of things we would eventually like to have, such as an all GIS system up on the Presidio web site, so people can see overlays of contaminations or excavated areas on the web. This way a person could click on a well and see contaminants over the past monitoring periods. All of these things are available, and we would like to get there as well. So, stay tuned. I would say in the next couple of months that will be rolling along. It will really streamline the information sharing process because people can check the web site, get e-mails announcing when there are documents available, and you can view the document on the screen. You don't even have to print it out.

MS. WRIGHT: Is that found easily through the main web site?

MR. NELSON: It would be a link from the

49

♀

Presidio trust.gov.

MR. YOUNGKIN: But not yet.

MR. NELSON: It will take a few months, but I have a firm that is managing our database right now that may be able to have certain people have password access to the database to do questionnaires and what not.

MR. MILLER: I was going to mention with that coming online, it is such a contrast that not so long ago it took a long time to get a physical paper showing where we are, and how long it took to get the first information graphically displayed in terms of the basic chemicals that were done several years ago when the Army was doing it.

So, it is pretty impressive that we are getting so rapidly online.

MR. NELSON: We are working on it, yes.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Are there any other comments, questions, input from the audience?

Without objection, meeting adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.)

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Jerry Anderson

Sam Berman

Bob Boggs, EKI

Edward Callahan

Julie Cheever

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Scott Miller

Jan Monaghan

Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

Jane Packer, Presidio Trust

Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board

Kate Poole

0410rab1.txt
Sharron Reackhof, Presi di o Trust
Bri an UI I ensvang, Park Servi ce
Tracy Wri ght
Gl ori a Yaros
Mark Youngki n

---o0o---

♀

51

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Tuesday, May 8, 2001

Log Cabin

7:15 p.m.

MR. KERN: Welcome everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. This is not the usual location, but hopefully we will have a few more community people arriving soon.

I would like to welcome everyone here tonight; Presidio Trust and their contractors that are here, the National Park Service, our regulators and community restoration advisory board members, and particularly any members of the public that are here tonight to listen to this meeting.

Did you see an agenda? And are there any changes to tonight's agenda? I see none. Any announcements? Committee reports? We don't have our usual committee reports' person.

Let's move on quickly to Item Number 5. Let's go to Chris and the project update.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Doug. Tonight I am going to be talking about some of the Presidio-wide CERCLA projects I have been working on on behalf of the Presidio Trust with my consultants.

First off, the Presidio-wide Contingency Plan, which,

1

♀

of course, has made headlines many times here at the RAB

meetings over the past year, is taking on a new face. We are on some consultation with DTSC. A month ago or so we decided to write a removal action work plan, so we essentially have a CERCLA decision document or state authorized decision document to deal with unknown contamination as it arises when the Trust is doing business, maintenance and excavation work, et cetera.

So, we have received outlines and have commented on them. And I actually sent out, just this week, a copy of the outlines for both the Contingency Plan, and the Removal Action Work Plan, and the outlines for review and comment on. There is a lot of material that is essentially what we saw before in the Contingency Plan, but it has taken on a different format a little bit.

So, as I have been mentioning, I would like to have an all-hands meeting to discuss the device strategy. What I propose is the week of the 22rd of May. And I will consult with folks who will attend the meeting, and make sure that works, and send out an email to remind people.

Also, I have, from my own hands, clandestinely delivered this very thin document, as you can see, which is the Presidio-wide Quality Assurance Project Plan and Sampling Analysis Plan. It is finally complete. We received approval from DTSC this week. The document is now

2

♀

in production. And we will be issuing it probably next week, no later than the end of the week, I would think, to people on the distribution list. And there will be a copy in the library for review, et cetera. Glad to see that has been completed.

On the Main Installation Feasibility Study we continue to work on a number of issues related to that project. As you know there was trenching at Fill Site 6 in February. And we released a report from which we are now awaiting comments from the regulatory agencies, the RAB, and so on. We discussed the sample results of the trenching activities at the RAB committee meeting last month. And we also discussed it a little bit today in a meeting, which I will talk about in a minute.

We also did some additional trenching sampling at Battery Howe Wagner on April 18th, soil sampling, and viewing the trenches, and logging the trenches that were done around the southern part of the Battery in the fill area. The samples from that area of investigation are arriving in small chunks. So, when we have a chance to get to them and interpret them, have EKI write up the results, we can begin to discuss the findings. I would anticipate, probably, being able to talk at the RAB committee meeting, probably, in June about sample results for Battery Howe Wagner.

3

♀

Background metals for the Feasibility Study, we have been continuing to meet with the stakeholders on this issue. We met on April 16th. We met last Tuesday. We met today. And we are also going to be meeting next Tuesday at 11:00 o'clock. We are wrapping up the discussions of potential contaminants and concern, and contaminants of concern as they relate to inorganics at the main installation sites. And we have had EKI working hard on

posting data on a lot of figures, and working collaboratively with others to get this information disseminated and discussed.

EKI came out to a RAB committee meeting on the 24th, and talked about the methodology. And it was very well received by the folks who were there. These changes that are going on right now in this background metals process are going to be incorporated into the Presidio Main Installation Feasibility Study, as well as applicable to the contingency action sites.

The ARARs and landfill regulations continues to be an outstanding issue. We are coming very close to getting concurrence between our lawyers and Park Service lawyers. We had a meeting on the 11th. There are just a few outstanding issues that, I think, we are getting rid of this week. And we will have that meeting. As soon as we send out the ARARs section of the FS, we can make an

4

♀

announcement about when it is going to be.

Moving on to a new project that we are going to be initiating here very soon. As part of our concept agreement with DTSC, and as far as our agreement and memorandum with the Park Service and the Army, we have agreed to conduct a remedial investigation feasibility study of four small armed firing ranges. These are sites where the Army had conducted initial investigations on and done some characterization, and had done some screening. And we are carrying forward four sites: the machine gun firing range near Building 637, CHP pistol range at Battery East, Lobos Creek protected range, and Lobos Creek target

range. We issued a task order to Treadwell and Rollo to begin the RI/FS.

We had a kick-off meeting with the Park Service and the Trust to discuss the initial tasks, which include gathering background information and data, reviewing the data, conducting site walks, and preparing a work plan. So, we will probably have a meeting in the future where we present the work plan strategy for this RI/FS at a RAB meeting.

That is all I have for tonight, unless anyone has any questions.

Okay. George, are you taking the groundwater monitoring part?

MR. FORD: Yes. I thought we would, at least

5

♀

the way the agendas were laid out, we are going to go over to -- well, I could, but it would be messing with the agenda.

MR. NELSON: Actually, tonight we have something that we have been talking about recently. As I mentioned earlier, we are going to talk about the chemical database screening that EKI conducted for us and the Feasibility Study. And we have Bruce Castle and Michelle King here from EKI to present the information. So, I'll introduce to you Bruce Castle. I think most of you have met both of these people before.

MR. CASTLE: All right. So, what this is is a bit of a continuation or an expansion of a subject we talked about, perhaps all the way last summer, in terms of the chemical screening process that was sort of the front end

to the Feasibility Study process itself. So, this is a bit of an expansion on that, a bit of a review, plus an expansion for those people who were here last July. We will see some slides that we had then, and have been modified a little bit.

So, we'll focus this discussion now on what we actually did to screen the database, the actual database, the chemical information we are using to make decisions here. And the real question is, of course, why do you screen the database? Why don't you just take it as it is? And there

6

†

are a number of reasons posted there. Remove the inappropriate chemicals from consideration, unreliable sample data from the evaluation process. And all with the idea that what we want to come out with is a data set that we believe to be representative of what really exists and will give way to a data set that allows us to focus the use of all our resources efficiently.

There are two approaches, two general ways of thinking about screening information. Meaning, deciding what is good, and what is not good, and what you will use and what you won't. First is, there are EPA guidelines, EPA guidances, on this process of data screening. And then there is, for lack of a better word, what I call practical screening. What else do you do in terms of applying professional judgment and experience? What else do you bring to that whole process of trying to discriminate the good from the bad?

EPA screening guidelines. These are -- this is kind of a summation of them. It is a little more complicated than

this. But, basically, you knock out data collected or analyzed by methods that are either not ordinary, or are just field screening methods. You don't want to compare a method that wasn't meant to be anything but a screening method with methods that are meant to be much more precise and accurate.

7

♀
†

You get rid of, at least in the sense of consideration, any chemicals that you didn't protect. People are really not concerned about those. We are concerned a lot about common laboratory contaminants. I guess it is not so unusual, or wouldn't be hard, to think about the fact that a laboratory, a chemical laboratory, is full of many of the chemicals, actually, that we are concerned about. The laboratory themselves is full of those. And sometimes those contaminants impinge on the notion that we get. So, we need to be concerned about what laboratory contaminants are out there and might affect the data.

There are compounds called tentatively identified compounds. We really don't have too many of them in the Presidio database. But those are ones where you are not 100 percent sure that it really exists. And they get reported by a number of methods. We weed those out because it is something less than a certainty that they have been properly identified, much less in a quantitative way.

Certainly, this is another biggy in a sense. Data rejected on the basis of failed quality control that are -- in any large laboratory analysis program you get, hopefully, a lot of good data and some bad data. And those

data that, for whatever the reason, failed the quality control measures that were in force, you don't want to be using those data to have those representative of the data.

8

♀

So, those are rejected.

And, then, infrequently detected chemicals, something that shows up only every once in a while, and is not reproducible either in time or in space. Those are considered fair game to be removed from serious consideration.

This is just elaborating on lab contaminants. Those of you who were here last July, we talked about this briefly. These are organic ones that are commonly used in the laboratory for extracting samples of chemicals of concern. And then the esters. These are the plasticides of many kinds. That if you want to know about plasticides, you go to Toys R Us and feel all the new plastic toys from all over the world. They have this greasy film. This is some sort of ester coming out of the thing that is added to plastic of all kinds, including plastic lab wear, to make it more flexible and more applicable for the job at hand. And then it sort of gets in things in terms of analysis.

Just in general, the criteria for screening these out -- and by that, meaning, qualifying the information and saying, "Gosh, we can't tell the difference between this detection of acetone. We can't tell whether we really saw it or whether it came from the lab." Okay? And the EPA has defined guidelines for that saying -- basically, there are quality control samples called a method blank. And if

9

♀

you see this chemical, any of these chemicals in the method blank, then for the batch of samples that that method blank went with, any sample to have less than this is a little bit strange, less than 10 times what you saw in the method blank. Anything less than that you can't say for sure it was really there, or put there by the lab. So, you put a flag beside it, and you say that. You might have a number that says 50 ppm. You want to qualify it with a flag that says it is really nondetect at that level.

And that is for the five common laboratory contaminants. And then there are all kinds of uncommon laboratory contaminants, other contaminants tested. In the sopori fic reading in the old RI, there is a section in there about all the different chemicals at one time or another that were detected in blanks by the many laboratories that the Army used in the past. And it is an extensive list. There are a lot of other chemicals, inorganics, copper, and silver, and other things. So, when these less common laboratory contaminants occur, then EKI says, "Okay. Apply a five times rule." If a sample has less than five times what you saw in the blank, we can't really say it is there, and you can qualify it.

That is a bit of a long discussion about the fact that laboratory contaminants can, in fact, be a big deal. And there is sort of a defined protocol here for dealing with

10

♀

them. It doesn't screen them out in the sense you don't

give them the boot. They aren't purged from the data base, but they are qualified in terms of saying, "We can't really say, "We detect them at these levels."

MR. KERN: I have a question. If the -- if it is not detected in the blank, is it five times the detection limit or five? Where do you --

MR. CASTLE: Well, it has to be detected in the blank generally to qualify for this. Now, I know for -- how we apply this, for example, the values, if it dilates a chemical used in a chemical process here at the Presidio. So, if we ran into any of that action, we qualify it as a laboratory contaminant, and put them away. So, we didn't follow a strictly five times, or strictly a 10 times rule on that.

MR. CASTLE: Yes, because those are infrequently detected chemicals in terms of, like I said, screening them out, putting them to the side. There are more than 100 naturally occurring elements in the periodic table. And there is a whole lot of them that have nothing to do with contamination. Some of them that got analyzed for -- just occasionally here for very special projects. We have a few scattered data points that came from specialized programs, investigations. We didn't weed those out in terms of looking at them as chemicals of concern.

And just as a generality, any contaminant that in a multiple event, or multiple sampling event for multiple sites, if you only saw it once and didn't see it again -- for example, in the monitoring, well, it occurs only once, never before, never after -- then, certainly, the EPA

guidance on that is that is probably that is contamination from the lab artifact. And it probably is something that shouldn't be carried into your, sort of, list of chemicals of concern and treated as a chemical of concern.

And this one -- I know the EPA guidance is sort of dry, and that sort of thing, and soporific for me. One of the things I found in the risk assessment guidance at the very end that I thought was almost a mastery of understatement, it basically said, quite simply, don't -- after you have done all this screening, after you have done all of the things that you say about screening, after that, do not accept it at face value. You can save all or any of the remaining results. In other words, look harder, look deeper, look closer, and we are going to.

It may be around this right here (indicating) that the remainder of the take is going to focus. How do we, in fact, go from the EPA screening guidance into this, what I call, practical screening? And looking at this very sort of set questions, how do we look deeper? How do we look closer? What do we look for to, in fact -- or identify

12

♀

data that is problematic data, and not actually representative of site conditions?

And it gets down to, in my own background in quality control, the chemical data is not like sort of widgets on an assembly line. It is hard to know a bad product. That is the essence of the problem. It is hard to identify a bad product in a whole group of chemical analyses. And we are going to see some examples of that and some examples of

how we go beyond this business of taking at face value anything that passed through the EPA guidance screening process.

I can't think of a better way to put this. Practically screening, in essence, you are trying to answer just one question, is there evidence that suggests there is a problem with the data? It is a very broad question, very general question. And I can scratch my head about how to -- Michelle and I both -- how do we sort of break this up, and put it into concise terms?

Well, it breaks up into two categories, kind of, practical considerations and more analytical considerations. Practical considerations, it is pretty -- some of them are pretty much no brainers. For example, data for samples that were excavated or remediated. It has been dug out. You don't really need that in there. In the -- for example, at Building 680 and 1151 and 1153 there

13

♀

were PCB excavations. And the samples that were previously there are now excavated. There is no need for those in the database.

This is peculiar to the Presidio base, erroneous duplicates in database. In any big database you always get strange things. We ran into a fairly large set of duplicates. And a duplicate sample in a laboratory, or in a sampling situation you are collecting a groundwater sample, and then every once in a while you collect a second one from the same place at the same time. You want to see how close they are to see how well your laboratory is doing and how much sort of total variability there is if you

collect the sample now versus 30 seconds from now or here versus six inches away.

And the interesting thing is that we ran into a whole lot of duplicate samples that were not close to what their original samples were, they were exactly -- they were exactly the same results as the original samples. And let me tell you after enough years in this business, that doesn't happen, or once in a blue moon. Once in a blue moon, not for thousands of times. I have seen it before that someplace along the line people get excited about -- guys like myself, gals like Michelle, what does all the duplicate data say? Compare them and manipulate them, and then maybe you put them back in.

14

♀

But you didn't put them back in quite the same way. You overrode the duplicates with the originals, it strikes me.

We had a fair number of duplicates in the Presidio database where at some point in time somebody made a real data management screwup and overrode the duplicates with the originals, and so we booted not the originals, we kept those all in, but we booted the duplicates out because let's not pretend that we have that kind of precision in our information, because it is pure pretense.

Another one of the major elements in the earth's crust, silicon, iron, aluminum, potassium, calcium, these are not contaminants, and they are useful, as we found in a small group working on background metals. They are useful for some things in

terms of looking for patterns. But they themselves are not chemicals of concern, and where we don't even use them.

I think now this one is a little more. I think of it as common sense, but I think we will need to go into it a little bit more. Groundwater. There are a couple of different kinds of groundwater samples that are in the Presidio data base, probably in most data bases for various facilities. And there are two distinctions we want to draw. One is to grab groundwater samples and monitoring

15

♀

well samples, and then there is filtered versus unfiltered or dissolved -- filtered is dissolved and unfiltered is total samples. And here we are basically talking about the difference between sample media as it is a host for inorganics. And in terms of grab versus monitoring well samples, here is a good example. This is a grab groundwater sample.

MR. NELSON: Are those amber bottles?

MR. CASTLE: No, they look like a thick stew.

Grab groundwater is where you go down to the groundwater and drop a bailer or some other sample collection device into that terribly stirred up muddy environment and send it off to the lab after putting it in bottles, as distinguished from a monitoring well that has been put in with a sand pack and developed slowly over time, and is meant to be much more representative of what actually the aquifer is doing in the case of metals. In the case of metals we don't have many. We have some of these grab groundwater samples at the same site that we have

monitoring wells. When we have both these, we get both, okay?

These are -- this is a soup, for Heaven's sake, a soup of particulates and that sort of thing. Send those to the lab for metals analysis, and you will get everything in the periodic table if you have a good enough machine. And many

16

♀
†

of those metal analyses will have nothing to do with what is in the groundwater. It will have everything to do with the particulate material you have suspended in the groundwater materials in this soup, and you will draw all kinds of erroneous conclusions.

Fill Site 6 here, we are kind of taking a look at both grab versus the next category, filtered and unfiltered samples. What we have here along this axis is copper, okay? On this very bottom guy you see zero, 200, 300 ppd, and you see a couple, half dozen documents. These represent a half dozen grab water samples from Fill Site 6 from a particular sampling event. And this is the range of copper values you see in these grab samples all the way up to 300 ppd.

These two guys -- we will take this one first. This is actually unfiltered. We will call it low flow. There are a dozen here, if you can see them all. There are a dozen little dots, and they are all down at the detection level from all the wells, the monitoring wells in Fill Site 6. No detectable copper, okay?

And this is also one of the places -- Fill Site 5 and 6 is one of the places where we tested the whole concept of

what is called low flow sampling, meaning you've got a monitoring well, you put a tube from it and you pump from it very, very slowly. So the water comes out looking very

17

♀

clear and it's settled. It isn't turbid like those grab samples were before, but very, very clear. You have a total sample.

So, we have got those low flow samples, and they were parallel filtered samples here where you take a disposable field filter, run the groundwater through this filter, which takes out the particulates and leaves you with a filtered sample. And both of those groups ended up with the same results for copper for Fill Site 6, and that is nondetect. There isn't copper here.

If you are to believe the grab groundwater samples, we have copper. If you are to believe well samples, you do not. Very distinct difference between these two in the data because we have done two things with groundwater samples. The grab groundwater samples where we have monitoring well data also, grab groundwater data samples get the boot. We want to use the more reliable, more representative well data.

And, then, for the monitoring well data itself, prior to June 2000 there was what is called total and filtered groundwater data were collected from the wells. And again, I am talking about metals here. We -- because the total data was not from low flow sampling but from whatever sampling people were doing at the time, whether it was a bailer or a pump, which can generate not as much turbidity

18

♀

as those soupy looking grab samples, but certainly quite a bit, we have said, okay, we will use the filtered samples for metals, for metals from the pre-June 2000 data for metals. And we will not use the unfiltered. There is a large difference.

This is from Landfill 8. This is lead in groundwater. This is pre-June 2000. And these guys here, this is the unfiltered data for lead. And then this barely discernable, the baseline, I think it was like 5 ppb or less than that. I am showing it as zero, very small number. The filtered -- these are paired samples, and the filtered samples there is only one teeny little bit, and I think it was about 5 ppb of lead, whereas the unfiltered samples, the soupy samples gave you all kinds of variable lead results. So again, for monitoring well data pre-June 2000, we don't use this.

For metals we did filtered data, and starting in July 2000 we are going to be conducting paired filtered and unfiltered, but the unfiltered is low flow. And they are very, very similar to this, okay? I know we did quite an experiment in Fill Site 5 and 6 which show the equivalents of the filtered and the low flow for metals.

MS. KING: Just to point out here where you have in the unfiltered sample like the spikes of the high concentration of lead, those samples showed a

19

♀

higher turbidity and higher things like aluminum and

iron that would be associated just with the solids in the sample. So you can see correlation across the samples. So it is not like there is some sporadic true lead in there. It is just what is in the solids that are in the sample.

MR. CASTLE: Okay. Some -- now, the analytical consideration, this is going to be a bit more challenging in the fact we have interesting considerations here dealing with some of the limitations of standard methods, how detection limits are determined, the limitation of existing QC measures, and the implications of incomplete validation within the database.

I don't know that I need to say this, but maybe I do. Standard methods do not guarantee good data, okay? Standard methods are standard methods. But there are situations, and I will call them almost pathological situations, where they don't work well. So there is no such thing as a perfect analytical method. And this revolves around the fact that certain analytes are prone to interference and stability issues that are not overcome by some of the standard methods, detection limits in terms of problems here.

If you think back to those vials with the soupy water and the clear water, the detection limits or reporting

20

♀
†

limits for a laboratory are not determined on samples that look like the stew. They look at those other samples, those bright crystal clear samples. So what a laboratory does to establish most detection limits is they take nice distilled, deionized water, spike it with a single analyte,

copper, lead or whatever it is, and then see how far -- how low a concentration can I get and still see it, detect it meaningfully with my machine, okay?

Now, that is all fine and good except the difference between being able to see it in that crystal clear water where only copper and none of its friends is there is one thing. When you put a whole crowd of analytes in there, it becomes quite another. And, in fact, what is actually the case is that you will get a very optimistic impression from that sort of approach to detection limits, very optimistic on how low you can actually see something.

There are a lot of bogus detection limits out there, and we've seen some in working with the background metals quoted at very, very low numbers, and they are absolutely not real. You could never see a real sample down at those kind of levels. And you will see those in a bit.

And I just have to further say that the quantitation, meaning measurements, meaningful measurements down at detection limit is challenging and prone to all kinds of interferences. So detection limits quoted to you by the

21

♀

Laboratory can be very, very optimistic, and you need to have that in the back of your mind.

Existing QC measures. Quality control is something I got into years and years ago. As an exploration geologist I was trying to determine what Mother Nature's signal was to tell me that there was buried ore or whatever in the crust of the earth what kind of subtle signal could I find. What I came face-to-face with again and again was not

Mother Nature's signal, but again and again all kinds of laboratory problems that I had to learn how to discriminate and try to push to the side and then find the signal.

Well, it is no different with this environmental data. There are the indications of quality control in the laboratory, the ones we rely on typically in the environmental side of things are not one hundred percent effective. And I would say that for false positives, meaning you get a false indication that something is there, okay, the existing QC methods that are out there do not discriminate that at all. They do not detect it at all. We will show some examples of that.

The existing QC measures of are not completely effective for sporadic lab contamination. All kinds of things happen. If the laboratory people have rubber gloves on that have talcum powder on them or other things, they have samples digesting in hoods that are rusty and things

22

♀

falling, et cetera, unless that contamination happens to affect the one that is called the method blank, but it affects some of the others, you will never see it, and you will assume what happened over here is something real, and yet it is lab contamination. So the existing quality control measures that we have, again, have two weaknesses which end up being things that someone like me looks very hard at.

Incomplete validation. In the case of the Presidio data base, the computer database that we got did not incorporate all that was known about problem data. The Army did a lot of validation and a lot of sleuthing with

their laboratory data and only part of that made it into the data base. And I know that from the fact that we can even go to the RI tables and the RI text, and here is a comment, one of the classic ones, that, you know, the Army speaks in the text about the fact that a whole group, a large group of thallium data was completely bogus, and they tossed it all out. You go to the data base, and you would never know that was the case. We had to go in and take the RI tables, oh, look, it has a flag that says it was bad data and rejected. Had to put it back in the data base. What we could determine was that the database was never really completed to the full extent that was possible at the time the Army left off working on it, said we have got

23

♀

the RI out, and we just -- we are just not going to bother to finish it.

MS. KING: I think they even say in the RI that they haven't finished updating the data base, I think it goes so far to say, because they included the diskettes in the RI that we have all used over the past four years don't represent the full validation.

MR. CASTLE: That brings up another point. Only a portion of the data was formally validated. For those of you who don't know it, there is a formal procedure called data validation. The EPA invented it. Because they didn't trust the laboratories, they invented it. So a third party had to come and take a hard closer look, which we are trying to do here, a formalized closer look at the data. Because, in fact, I think they recognized there were

problems that were slipping through the measures, and there were things like several laboratories actually performing actually fraudulent nonanalyses, dry labbing we used to call it when I was in college.

So, they invented a complicated procedure for validating your data. Well, it is expensive, and it is time consuming. And it is a tradition to not stop at only a portion of the data. So, only a portion of the data, whether it could be recorded in a database or not, still only a portion of it got the very hard look from a data

24

♀

validator.

So, some of the examples of problem data. This one is -- actually this is not the Presidio. This is a start to someplace I want to go with Presidio data. This is actually from a project that they did down in Cupertino last year. The metal that we are analyzing here is selenium. And up here you have got the concentrations zero to 180 ppm.

MR. NELSON: In soil.

MR. CASTLE: Yes, in soil. And what I have plotted here, these occurred in batches of about 8 to 12 samples over time. Sample and time kind of go increased in this direction. And for those of you who have fooled around at all with metals and inorganic data know that these kind of values tend to -- 180 ppm selenium, they don't occur in the earth's crust very many times, not naturally anyway. And what we are really seeing here is absolute fiction, okay? A very reputable lab produced this data for me over a period of three weeks, and it is

absolute fiction, okay?

This is one of the standard methods. The laboratory that produced this data performed the method on ICP exactly according to the book. There is nothing a data validator would find wrong with this data. Except when you analyze it by three other methods, two EPA and one non-EPA, all

25

♀
†

those samples have less than 5 ppm selenium.

MR. BOGGS: Where did the lab's QC fall down on this job? Obviously the lab's QC, if they are getting that kind of error --

MR. CASTLE: Because the lab QC has no way of detecting a false positive with an MSMSD. If you are spiking selenium on top of false positive, you get it back and you go, I am fine. Your lab sample, controlled sample doesn't have the same matrix, and the laboratory analyzes that I got all my selenium and I -- all their QC methods said just fine, but it wasn't there.

This is an arch example of false positives. There are four. I call them the big three plus one. There are four metals done by ICP that you should almost never trust. If you get a detect, you should confirm it. Selenium, antimony, valium and silver. These four are very, very prone from false positives, and we will go into the why of it. I can see some sort of skeptical looks. But, in fact, again, you can get numbers that make it look like you have a tremendous contamination problem, and it is absolutely bogus.

The interesting thing other than the fact that these

numbers are high, you also see over time the laboratory, whatever was happening in the lab to cause this got worse and worse, okay? We are getting higher and higher.

26

♀

MS. CHEEVER: Could you remind us what ICP is.

MR. CASTLE: ICP is a way of analyzing for metals in inorganics where you take a small amount of sample, you take some soil sample, and you dissolve it in acid, and you take some of that acid solution and you squirt it into a plasma flame, extraordinarily hot flame, and what happens is that each of the little atoms and ions of a different metal will get all excited with all that energy and heat and will give off light radiation, okay, light radiation that is very specific to that metal. In fact, it will give off several different kinds, many -- some of them many different radiations.

And what an ICP does is try to -- just like a prism, I can take a light beam with a prism and spread it out into its colors. Expand that idea that you have really stretched out that expansion, and you are seeing individual little lines that tell you, gosh, this line is produced when sodium is burned. This line is produced when potassium is burned and emits a different kind of light. ICP attempts to look at a whole big spectrum of that and say, this is sodium, and the higher that peak is, more intense that light is, the more concentration there is. And if I squirt in a known amount of sodium and measure how high or how intense that is and I compare it to what I have

27

♀

done in my sample, I can make a comparison.

It is a -- the key to it is that it is a multi element method of analysis. When I was in school way too many years ago to talk about, chemistry was the science of separation, where you separated out chemical species sort of in groups in a series, in an elaborate series until you could isolate what you want by weighing it or getting it to react in the form of color. But that is long and tedious and expensive, so people have tried to develop over the years where you can get everything under the sun all at once. And it can be applied to all situations. It is a wonderful concept.

One of the things that is true about that is there is, again, no method in something as complicated as that that produces all these vast spectrum lines. You have got to be very, very good in order to pick out exactly what you want and know exactly what you have got. Because as we are going to see with some other examples, but it becomes extraordinarily difficult for some of these elements in order to pick out do I have an antimony line or something else. In fact, that is one of the bases for that selenium data, the false positive data, is probably the analyst grabbed the wrong line.

This is another ICP. This is, again, a non-Presidio example. And I want to start with the two non-Presidio

28

♀

examples to show you the universality of the problem. I

have seen this again and again over the years. When you scratch below the surface of most, not all, most silver detections, most thallium detections, selenium, ammonium, you find problems. You don't find real information; you find problems.

Silver. This particular one was one where I had sporadic silver. Didn't seem to show any particular trend, but elements anywhere between one-and-a-half to a little over 6 ppm silver, which is the kind of thing which I know in our background metals eyebrows would go up and say what did the Army do here? These are the kind of levels you don't normally see in the earth's crust unless you are in a mining district that has silver in it. So this would be construed as there is a silver problem here, and who spilled it?

In fact, when I have all these examined again, analyzed by a better neutron activation, better method for some metals, you take a much larger sample, and you stick it in a nuclear reactor, bombard it with neutrons, and it will give off characteristic radiation but many fewer spectra, much simpler and much more diagnostic and much less interference prone than ICP, and my neutron activation showed these are all less than the detection limits, all less than 2 ppm.

This is all bogus again, false positives, things that you think that are there that are not. This one is a little more challenging. I apologize for this. I pulled this out of the literature. This gets to part of the spectrum interference, to the heart of how you get false

positives.

In this particular case, and again I pulled this out of literature and no magic about this, here we -- one of these peaks, this is 9 meters long. This is wave length here. Here is a peak for cobalt, right here. Well, underneath it titanium has a peak in exactly the same place. Now, if you happen to be looking for titanium, and you go looking at that wave length, and you measure it, and even if you know you have got cobalt, what you are going to measure is going to be that. And you are going to say, I have that much titanium, and you don't. You have something else, overlapping peaks.

Because, in fact, again, these spectra, the burning spectra from the different elements produce many, many, many different lines, okay? And it takes a very good instrument, very good instrument to discriminate between this one and this one that are very close by or even overlap.

A similar type thing, this is called peak overlap, chemists call wing overlap. Here is a lead line, lead peak

30

♀

right here. If you were doing your detection limit in that crystal clear water, you would say, okay, I can see lead at that wave length. No problem. Oh, yes, there is a problem because, in fact, right next to it is an aluminum peak which has a shoulder on it, this side of it, that starts over here and crosses over in that same area of the lead peak.

So, if you have a soil sample which will have aluminum

in it, there is hardly any particulate of the earth's crust that doesn't, you get it in solution, you analyze it by ICP, then this wing overlap this aluminum is going to push the lead up into higher levels than is really there.

This one is called background interference. Once again, if you think back to the soupy samples and clear samples, in clear samples -- this happens to be gold. In a clear sample gold produces this kind of peak. In the presence of aluminum actually there is a whole lot of noise generated at this level, okay? Suddenly you no longer can -- you are not measuring the peak from here to here for gold to tell you how much you have got. You are now no longer able to discriminate or able to tell what is going on below here.

And, in fact, what passes sometimes for a, quote, blank contamination is, in fact, silver. This is a good example. Silver is something that doesn't stay in standard solutions

31

♀

very well, okay? Remember, this is how people -- how the analyst knows how much they have got in a sample. They have got standard solutions with known amounts in it. Well, silver doesn't like to stay in solution as some of the other metals. It starts coming out. So you as an analyst, you think you have got a 10 ppm standard, but there is much less and less silver in it.

So, in essence you start moving down into lower and lower, weaker and weaker signals until you get down into an area like this full of noise, and then all of a sudden you think you are seeing real silver. Like that previous example where silver was going up and down like this, my

own interpretation that was a deteriorated silver standard that had gotten very, very weak and had gotten down into one of these levels where there is lots of noise, and now we are interpreting that noise as real information.

This --

MR. MILLER: Question on the lead one. Obviously lead, aluminum is a pretty common and important one, I would think, for the special interferences. What kind of contaminations do you start, for instance, if you have aluminum at one part per million, or would you expect that the lead interference could add 20, 30, 40 percent to the lead.

MR. CASTLE: That is a good question, and the

32

♀

answer is it actually differs from sort of which lead line you are using, which lead wave length, and even the instrument. The instruments vary tremendously one to another how well they discriminate these things. So it might be 30 percent, or it might be 200 percent.

Once you have solutions over, say, 1,000, say 1,000 micrograms per kilogram aluminum or iron is a real bad one manganese, magnesium. You get fairly strong solutions of those guys, and they really start interfering. How much they interfere depend on which one of these lines that you pick and, again, how well your instrument is tuned up.

MR. MILLER: Is that true for the ICP as well as the other tests?

MR. CASTLE: It is particularly true with the ICP. The ICP is particularly prone to this problem.

So, just a few examples on Presidio data just to show you how it occurs here. Here, this shows a couple of things. Here is a whole group from 1994, a single batch done by a laboratory that is no longer in existence, actually, where all the results were -- oh, say, 2 to 122 ppm silver. Oh, this is not good. Again, silver doesn't occur usually in the earth's crust in those amounts. This is some indication of contamination.

Now, what was -- there are two things of interest here. One is how we determined that there is a problem

33

†

here is that I take a look at silver through time, I take a look at my data through time, and all of a sudden here is a whole batch, a single batch from a single laboratory where the silver is all unusually high, there is a red flag. A red flag goes up there is something wrong here. And, in fact, when we went to the RI -- I mean, I flagged this as unusual. I said, I don't believe this. I have seen this story again and again.

Then when we went to the RI tables, this little flag problem that says again the database Senock (sic) said these were solid detections. When I went to the RI tables, there is the discussion about the data validators having found silver in the blank and that all these data should be qualified as nondetect. We can't tell whether we really got it or not because it is in the blank at enough concentration that these are meaningless numbers.

So, that illustrates two things. One is the problem of the database that we have been dealing with does not fully incorporate this information, the information that was out

there. And two, the fact that you can when you see something unusual in terms of a pattern in time or space with one of these metals, silver's one that I called the big four problems, the flag should go up, and you should take a harder look because it definitely is not real.

They say it is blank contamination. My own sense is it

34

♀
†

is probably more like that example I gave earlier where these detection limits -- where the detectability of silver, the amount of silver in the standard got low so that the amount of signal that was being interpreted as 1 or 5 ppm got down into that very low noisy range and we get all kinds of bogus information. For whatever reason it is false positive information. And in this case I didn't need to boot it, I needed to flag it and say this doesn't reflect silver contamination at all.

Some of you who were here last July saw this as an example, again, one of the factors going to practical screening. What do we look for? We look for trends in time and space that all of a sudden cluster somewhere, and you say this doesn't make any sense. This was a series of low level 1, 2 dca in here. We are talking about .5 to 2.4 ppb, very, very low levels of 1, 2 dca, and it happened to coincide to a very tight time range between the 9th and the 12th of January in 1995, one lab. Very tight time range, values very close to detection limit, cuts across a whole lot of different sites. We will look at these different groundwater sites. You don't see 1, 2 dca pop up again. So it says to me this for whatever the reason has shown up as

a lab contaminant and one event contaminant samples sporadically from a whole group that was sent to them and has never reproduced again, very low levels.

35

♀

And in that particular example actually there is a compound that can be misidentified as 1, 2 dca at very, very low levels, even what is called GCMS analysis. Looked at it in the time series again. This is another way that we use for this practical screening here is we take the analysis for a particular well, 1, 2 dca, and we plot it sequentially in time. And lo and behold if it stands out like a sore thumb and is not repeated. I have seen that enough times to know it is not good.

Selenium, one of the big problems, this is a single batch of dissolved groundwater, meaning filtered groundwater done by a lab that actually is still around. And there is a whole series of low level selenium lets out between 6 -- or about 6 and 12 ppb across a large spectrum of different wells, okay? And it looks to me like if you wanted to draw a line in time, after starting about the 11th of September 1995, between then and the 15th, this lab had a selenium contamination problem.

When we look at the next slide, I picked the well and plot that well, selenium against time. Sure enough, that one stands out like a sore thumb, and the subsequent analyses don't show it. What do I say to myself? It is confined to a single batch done by a single lab confined in time, cuts across lots of different sites, is not reproducible. This is a lab problem. And again, for my

36

♀

own skeptical way of thinking, when I see selenium, my antennae go up, and I say, I don't know this was a case where in this case in a figure dissolved selenium data I gave the boot to. I don't trust it.

The interesting part of it, dissolved selenium, just to show how things can happen, the little disposable plastic filter that you use in the laboratory or out in the field for filtering all this muddy stuff to get a good filtered sample is in itself a problem. They are manufactured. They have a very high surface area. They have all kinds of junk in them. If you read the fine print, it says run a lot of water through this before you collect your sample basically to get the junk left in it. That can be all kinds of junk left in manufacturing. I had a chemist tell me in a laboratory once filtering is one of the main problem areas that gross contamination. And I think that is probably what happened in this case. So something what was supposed to help you ended up shooting you in the foot.

MS. YAROS: When you see results like in the previous one where the one number was so different from the others and that was a red flag to you that there is something wrong with the data.

MR. CASTLE: Yes.

MS. YAROS: That is you thought something was wrong with that because one was so different. Then what

37

♀

do you do? Do you throw it out? Do you run it again?

MR. CASTLE: We are doing sort of data archeology. I am looking back at data that is as much as ten years old. I can go back. The sample was identified in 1995. I say to myself, this looks bad, so I boot that data point. But all those other data points behind it, all those other samples, I have no reason to think those are bad analyses. I had a reason to get rid of that one because that one and the whole batch that was associated with it from the other wells, I gave those the boot.

MS. REACKHOF: It was a time and place.

MR. CASTLE: It was defined in time.

MS. REACKHOF: That they were all quite bad. When he looked at it, it was a lab error.

MR. CASTLE: One of the unstated things here in terms of quality control, there is almost no better quality control tool than a time series. If you can look at something, the same thing over time, you have much more ability to discriminate changes, whatever is causing them, than some almost esoteric laboratory QC measure, method blank or whatever. Because, in fact, I can see when something unusual happens. You can see when something starts going up or down or one spike that doesn't fit. The human eye is good at picking those things out. In terms of

38

♀
†

practical screening, that kind of quality control, time is good.

MR. NELSON: You are also taking things, has this thing been detected at other media and, like you said, showed up all at once, wasn't there before, and

then went away. Not like it came along and injected selenium into the ground and it came into the well.

MR. CASTLE: Right. It is a multifaceted decision that you make. In other words, some of the things I ask myself is, does the problem cut across lots of different sites, lots of different depths, lots of different soil? Was it restricted in time? Was it restricted to a single lab? When you put all those coincidences together, you say the probability of this being real gets very, very small. You don't see that in EPA guidance. This is the kind of thing you have to bring to bear on real data.

MS. YAROS: You are doing new measurements, or are you not?

MR. CASTLE: Oh, yes.

MR. NELSON: The ones we took last summer at Battery Howe Wagner and Fill Site 6 and data validation. We are working with a lot of -- the Presidio data base has 140,000 some odd records in it, and the majority of them were not collected by the Presidio Trust. Sort of an understanding was that we weren't going to go back

39

♀

and try to characterize the sites.

MS. YAROS: It is easier to, even though some of it is faulty.

MS. KING: Even stuff the Trust is going to generate better than the Army did, but these types of problems can happen in the sampling that the Trust is doing now. That example that Bruce gave for the site at Cupertino, that was done last year from a very reputable

lab, a lab that the Trust is using now. Some of them are general problems.

MR. NELSON: We are taking some steps in some cases when we receive information from our consultants, like he was saying, we might have another laboratory run the sample again in a different method to see whether or not we have seen false positives.

MR. CASTLE: What do people say about real estate? What are the three important things about real estate? Location, location, location. In terms of some of these analytes, the big four that I call them, confirm, confirm, confirm. So if you have got low level silver all of a sudden by ICP, for Heaven's sake confirm by ICP, MS or by another method. Because otherwise Bob and Tim, all of us will be scratching our heads, what is really going on, and we will argue about whether it is real, et cetera. It is easier to cut it off at the pass

40

♀

by taking a harder look at it, and that is ultimately what we hope to get to. What the Trust is hoping to get to is much more real time quality control where Chris calls up the lab, you have to confirm this. Not all of us sitting around the table five years later saying I wonder what this means. Answer it instead.

MS. KING: One thing that is nice about the Presidio and the wells that were there that Montgomery and Watson did was several years of monitoring the bulk of the main installation, potential concerns about groundwater data. We very often have at least ten rounds of sampling from a given well. And so there were

a few cases where, you know, maybe the spike didn't happen at the beginning in the RI, but it happened halfway through. You would have nothing and then nothing. So there we would tend to eliminate that data. But if the spike happened at the end, and I think where all of a sudden we detected TCE which we had never seen before, nothing, nothing, nothing, hit, in that case we are keeping it in because we don't have anything to follow it to say it is not a problem.

So, we did have to make judgment calls as to when we would eliminate it, but it is always an obvious one, three or four or five rounds of follow-up of unique spikes.

MS. POOLE: Also the rocks that are unusual, we

41

♀

are talking about spikes and false positives. Are there false negatives?

MR. CASTLE: Good question. Interestingly enough you don't see that as often. In the realm I deal with in metals we don't see that as often as these false positives. But you do see it in volatiles, for example, things that are extremely sensitive and easy to lose. So just a little bit of mishandling of the sample and all of a sudden a nice solid goes down 200 and it used to be 2,000. Would I give that the boot? You bet. I don't believe that because, again, it is so unusual, not reproducible, the data after that doesn't support it.

I am focusing really a lot on the false positives partly because we have been wrestling with metals, and the ICP tends to produce a lot of that, where we tend to see

more -- we tend to see more of the false negatives but, again, unusual like that. We don't believe it. We think there is a reason for it being no good. It gets the boot.

One last thing here before I have bored you all to death with these horrible looking graphics. One of the other ways of distinguishing something that is a product of spectral interference is when you have got your antimony in a group of samples -- this is from LabEd, which is a notoriously bad laboratory that we have had all kinds of problems with -- when you get for one of the majors, iron,

42

♀

magnesium or the big contributors, this one happens to be magnesium, when you get an almost perfect linear relationship between concentration of this guy and concentration of this major, you have got a spectral interference. This is a signature of spectral interference. Because measuring antimony measuring from 30 to almost 200, those are extraordinary levels of antimony that you will not see in a normal situation, but it is in lock step with magnesium. And again, all the one batch, one already known to be an unreliable lab. What was actually being measured here wasn't antimony, it was magnesium.

And just to sort of sum it up, really what we do is we start with the regulatory guidance to screening data and then try to bring all of the professional judgment and experience we can to the table and as much common sense to the table to further that guidance, take nothing at face value in order to obtain a data set that we really believe is representative of site conditions, whatever they are,

whether it is contaminated or uncontaminated, but as good a determination of the truth as we can get. That is where we have been trying to go with this. That is probably enough.

MR. NELSON: Thanks.

MS. REACKHOF: Any additional questions?

MS. CHEEVER: In the grab samples, what was the

43

♀
†

explanation for the copper? Just that it was in the earth?

MR. CASTLE: Yes, sure. In other words, the soil. It really is soil that is entrenched in that water, in the dirty water. The copper, almost any other element you can think of is there at some level. And so you have entrenched that in the water, and then when the laboratory acidifies that, it puts some of the copper that is on those soil particles and puts it into solution in the groundwater. But now you have partially digested it just as you do with a soil sample. You take strong acid in there, dissolve the copper and feed it to the ICP or whatever in the solution.

Well, in a mini way that is what a grab sample does when you are taking it for metals, because they digest that. It will partially attack those little sediment particles and pull copper or lead out of that because it is in there as part of the ordinary constituents of the earth's crust. But it will do so in a way that is not reproducible. Because if I sampled a well at this time and dug samples out of it to, and give it to Bailer (sic), and he uses a pump, I get a dirtier sample. So, he gets lower

copper than I get. And neither one of them mean anything except he was able to get less mud in his sample than I got. Not that there was really copper in there, but it is

44

♀

because what you end up analyzing is a soil sample rather than a water sample.

MS. KING: I think the grab groundwater samples show an extreme of very turbid samples, soupy stuff when you have an unfiltered versus a filtered groundwater sample from a well. Sometimes you have trouble with wells, or I could have a sample that really is quite cloudy. But other times it is not as extreme. That is what Bruce was trying to get to with the example. Sometimes depending on how the well it is purged before you sample it and the type of sampling method you use will determine how cloudy or turbid that sample is.

What we want to get an understanding of is what are the actual metals that could be migrating and causing the problem and go from Landfill E into the riparian corridor. You want to know what is moving in that groundwater and what could be moving contamination. So that is why our focus is on trying to get what is representative of what is really in groundwater.

MR. PONTON: When would you want to use unfiltered samples?

MR. CASTLE: Surface water and seeps. We have definitely used the unfiltered samples with that. And, in fact, you know, I guess my preference, if you can get to an unfiltered sample that doesn't have a lot of this

45

♀

stuff entrenched in it rather than having to run it through a filter that can actually introduce other contamination, my preference is there. So when you can, I would use an unfiltered one in preference to a filtered one if I could get a really good unfiltered one. What do you think, Michelle?

MS. KING: When you are talking about surface water and seeps and stuff like that, you typically do take a total sample, an unfiltered sample, because you want something that the critters could be exposed to in that water body as opposed to in groundwater.

The EPA preference is to use unfiltered samples, but there is a presumption that you will collect your unfiltered sample using a quality method like the low-flow-sampling technique where you get truer sample. It is more costly to do that. And a lot of people just don't take the time and effort to do low flow sampling. But EPA has published guidance papers on this low flow sampling versus filtering, and, you know, filtering is a lot easier to do than low flow sampling.

MR. CASTLE: I have to say that from a couple of decades in quality control and lots of other sorts of examples, getting -- collecting good samples is bothersome and hard work. You have to want to really do it. And there is a tremendous -- there is more poor samples

46

♀

collected in the world than good ones. And the trouble is

most of us at the final end when we are looking at numbers, it is invisible to us.

MR. KERN: On the ICP measuring device that you mentioned and you get these spectral lines for a particular element, is it then a computer program that matches all those lines or is it a person? How does that part of it work?

MR. CASTLE: Years ago -- this is a good question. Years ago there was an actual physical match-up, but I think really early on it was so complicated it went very quickly to a computer matching. And it has become more and more complicated.

Interestingly enough, the computer matching also attempts to do computer corrections for some of this overlap. And part of the problem I see is some of the corrections that are out there work, and some of them go wrong. And when you get, say, above a certain amount of iron, the iron correction for selenium goes awry, goes badly awry, that sort of thing.

Under the surface of it all there is a tremendous amount of computer manipulation that is coming out with anything that's tremendously complicated. You have done similar things in geophysics, in seismic --

MR. KERN: I am trying to visualize somebody

47

♀
†

with some kind of a diagram and trying to line up all these lines.

MR. CASTLE: Yes, early on they did that, but that is long ago and far away.

MR. BOGGS: I have actually done it. It is not
Page 42

as hard as you would think because the lines also come up in color. So a yellow line is very different from the purple or blue line. So you know certain things about it, that, yes, you have got sodium, and you don't have this in there, that sort of thing.

MR. NELSON: I want to add a comment about why we were talking about the database and screening process. Again, as you many of you know who were here a year ago and more, we talked about this, as Bruce mentioned, and we discussed how the Presidio Trust and the RAB were going to be going forward with the Feasibility Study and screening out chemicals and coming up with a final list of chemicals of concern which would help us prepare for the sites.

Well, the database was compiled, released. We took some additional samples, we added more data. And, so, we had to go back to the drawing board and start screening chemicals again. And I thought there had been enough questions raised in the past about how were we doing this chemical screening. Were we taking things that looked dangerous and screening them out?

48

♀

I think what Bruce's presentation tonight has done is it shows that there are some reliable ways of looking at the data and showing where some of these questions come up. I know Doug had questions about cyanide and PCBs, and I think hopefully this presentation has illustrated some of those, how some of those questions can be resolved by screening and professional judgment.

MS. KING: Again, just to follow on his

comment, I know Doug certainly had some questions that were inside him for a while, but some of the other things it may be geared more toward Jim and Bob who are sitting in these meetings. But if there is something -- I think we handed you a little description of what we are screening out of the database. If you have any questions or issues, we want to hear now. Because the worst thing is we have to go back and say, I don't like the way you got rid of the silver qualification. Then it affects how we look at the fill site, for example. So we want to get feedback on these types of things as soon as possible.

MR. KERN: Looking at the time, we have quarter to 9:00, approximately, and three presentations by George. And we know George couldn't say anything in a minute or two, so we have got to give him some time. So how about if we take five or ten minutes, come right back, finish this off.

49

♀

(Off the record)

MR. FORD: All right. Well, I really will try to go quickly, and I promise not to make up any facts as I go along or anything like that. So all these various things should help compress it.

Let's start off with the groundwater monitoring program. I am doing this one for Jennifer Coats who was conducting a kick-off meeting and health and safety briefing with the consultant at 5:30 this morning for this project, so that is her excuse for not coming this evening.

The sampling plan was distributed in the middle of last month. It is a draft that went out to the stakeholders and

the agencies. Our thanks go to Bob and Jim and also Brian. Everybody was standing next to their mailbox waiting for this thing to come out, and once it came into their mailboxes they reviewed it very quickly and gave us turn-around from the comments in record time. So we were able to get out and actually start the sampling, which was kicked off this morning.

Sampling will take roughly two weeks. And the sampling plan for this round simply has us doing analysis. We are doing a well purging and sampling and chemical analysis essentially the same way that the Army did it at the end of their tenure. And the reason we are starting out that way is for consistency, basically. We don't want to be

50

♀

changing well purging methods or sampling or changing analytes for the Trust's first time out of the box. First time I want to do it just the way the Army did so we can see how comparable our data is.

As we go on and come to do quarterly rounds of sampling, we are going to be looking at the whole analytical program, and we will most likely be recommending some changes to it to make it more efficient or to modernize it as the case may be. You know, if we identify one that is not detect, we may propose to drop those out. That will be done in the form of short reports or a letter that will come out before the next round of sampling. So that basically any changes we propose, people get a chance to see it before we do it. And if you have comments or disagree with some of the changes, there will be some time

to talk about it before the change is actually made.

That is what I have to say about the groundwater monitoring. Any questions about that before we go on to Mountain Lake?

Okay, Mountain Lake we have been and our consultants have been working on it diligently since we last met. The essential story hasn't changed, although a few of the details have been adjusted. Basically the sampling that we did which included three -- you may recall we sampled three storm drain inlet's from Park Presidio Boulevard and then

51

♀

had 15 core sampling points within Mountain Lake. In a nutshell they show elevated chemicals. Lead is the primary contaminant. It is the main actor there.

And the pattern of occurrence of several of the metals, and the several metals would be basically lead, zinc, cadmium and copper, if I am correct, seems to indicate pretty clearly a source. The source is Park Presidio Boulevard. The hottest concentrations are all on the west side of the lake. They occur -- and some of the very hottest samples were actually taken out of the storm drain inlet's on Park Presidio Boulevard. Collectively those data suggest that we have a -- in the reports this is called an AOPC, which is Area of Potential Concern. But essentially this shows you where the action is.

There are high lead levels. There are some elevated levels of TPH, gasoline -- I am sorry diesel and motor oil concentrations in this area. This pretty much suggests or it shows you the area where some type of remedial work to address the elevated lead concentrations

would be required. What is not shown but would also need to be addressed are where we think the lead is coming in. The lead and some of the other metals are coming off the road through these storm drain inlet's. Those would have to be cleaned out, and something else would have to be done with those, possibly rerouting them to the storm sewer.

52

♀
†

But again, some of our cleanup levels are changing, but the basic problem is on the west side of the lake.

If we can go to the next slide, the chromium URS has done quite a bit of correlation analysis on the different metals to try to determine if they all came from the same source, if they all come from Park Presidio Boulevard, just where they might have come from. They find that chromium, nickel, and Vanadium probably come from a common source, and it appears that that source is probably not from cars on the street. It seems most likely at this point that those three metals, the elevated concentrations of those three metals in the lake sediments may come from serpentine in the fill soils that were dumped on the west side of the lake during and after construction of Park Presidio Boulevard.

Generally speaking, again, the highest concentrations of metals, and these are all of the elevated metals, occur in the upper 2 feet of sediment at the bottom of the lake, and we believe that this upper two feet represents the sediments that have most recently been deposited, which is in the last 60 to 70 years.

We also found Lindane. It is a chlorinated pesticide.

It is actually a chlorinated cyclohexane, which I guess is a ring with six carbons and a bunch of chlorine sticking out of it like spikes. It was found at low concentrations

53

♀

slightly above the proposed cleanup level in four of the five samples tested. Those occur pretty generally across the lake. It does not appear to be concentrated on the west side. And the Trust and URS are still trying to figure out what the occurrence of lindane means and what, if anything, needs to be done about it.

As far as next steps go, the draft report has been sent to the Army, and I believe it has also been -- circulated copies have been sent out to stakeholders. So if you are usually on the mailing list, if you haven't got one yet, it should be arriving shortly. The report that we sent to the Army did have a cover letter on it from Sharron Reackhof that explained to the Army that we believe the results indicate that the main problem in the lake has resulted from the presence of Park Presidio Boulevard and that through the memorandum of agreement between the Trust the Park Service and the Army, the Army retains all responsibility for anything happening in the park that is a result of CalTrans' activities. It is sort of a convoluted chain of logic, but it basically leads to the Army and/or CalTrans.

There will be lots of discussions about this over the next year, but the Trust's position, and I believe the Park Service probably agrees with us here, is that the financial responsibility for the cleanup of the lead rests with the

54

♀

Army or CalTrans. We are going to let those two sort it out among themselves who is going to pay, but we think one of them should.

We are going to analyze remedial alternatives. Basically, this site will be included in the main installation Feasibility Study, and we will analyze alternatives in that document. And, again, the goal is the same as the last few months. We hope to have selected a remedy to get the Feasibility Study by the end of this year, in early 2002, put it out to bid, select a contractor and do the cleanup next summer. So we are still on schedule to do that.

MS. CHEEVER: This is all new sampling done by the Trust, done by you, right?

MR. FORD: The samples were actually taken in January of this year.

MS. CHEEVER: It seemed like -- I can't remember exactly what the results were, but it seemed like this is consistent. Wasn't lindane also found by the Army, and yet supposedly the golf course changed its pesticide habits? So I am curious why that is happening. But I am also interested in general if this stuff is consistent with what was found five years ago.

MR. FORD: Chris or Brian, do you know?

MS. CHEEVER: Not just the pesticides, but the

55

♀

other things, elevated lead and so on.

MR. ULLENSVANG: The pesticides are generally consistent. I am going to compare them. Lindane is not an uncommon pesticide and one that is still used. So it is not a surprise or unique to find pesticides found in the last sampling were all forms of lindane. When you see a number of different chemicals that come up in that compound, they are all different transformations of lindane that could occur.

As far as the compatibility of the metals versus the past data, if you recall at a RAB meeting probably in November or December there was a presentation on this sampling and the past data, and the suspicion was that the past data and sampling efforts may have missed a relatively thin layer. And this sampling was to be designed to focus in and identify if that could be it.

Well, as George points out, the contamination is in a fairly thin layer. It is all in the top two feet. And if you look at the data, it is all -- it appears it might be even shallower than 24 inches. So in that regard it is not the same as what was found before, but it is not inconsistent given just the unique conditions that each sampling represented, if that makes sense.

MS. CHEEVER: It does, but I missed that meeting, I think. Thanks, though, for reiterating it.

56

♀
†

MR. FORD: Any other questions about Mountain Lake? If you think of any others while we go on to these other ones, we can always go back.

Okay. The next thing is The Commissary Interim Source Removal Action, which we just call the commissary cleanup.

The second phase of it, which is blocking off the affected part of Mason Street and taking out the road and cleaning up the petroleum in the soil beneath the road, is starting now. In fact, we expect the detour to be installed tomorrow or very early on Thursday morning. And then once the detour is in place, that will run the traffic through the area that we already cleaned up in the commissary parking lot. They will start digging, and we expect that part of the work to go pretty quickly and should be done and have the road repaved by late June.

So, this is what the Phase 1 excavation, which is in the northwest corner of the commissary parking lot, looked like at its maximum extent. This was about five weeks ago, I guess. This shot is taken looking westward. That hole is about six feet deep, and the bottom of it, which is dark gray, is actually the top surface of the bay mud. Almost everything on top of the bay mud is fill that was put there by the Army or the Panama Pacific Exposition builders. So when you go down six feet, you hit the bay mud.

Since then we have filled up this hole, and now this is

57

♀

what it looks like today. We don't have the little plastic cones any more. But you can see the dark paving. This is new pavement that we put in, and beginning tomorrow there will be a stop sign put up out here on Mason Street, and then traffic, both pedestrian, bicycles and cars, will detour through this way and come back out on Mason Street to the west. And then this whole area of Mason Street will be torn out and cleaned up. So please drive carefully.

And if you know anybody who drives on Mason Street regularly, please ask them to pay attention because we do see people hauling through there at about 50 miles an hour just kind of doing it by memory. After tomorrow anybody who goes through there at 50 miles an hour is going to end up in the hole, which would not be good. We are not sure. The worst offenders do seem to be muni buses. I think they go through there maybe even faster than 50, and we haven't quite figured out how to slow them down. We figure if one of them ends up down in the hole, we can leave it there as an example.

There will be a stop sign here and a stop sign that is to the left off the picture. This one concerns me quite a bit because it is about a one mile long straightaway that leads down to a new stop sign that people don't expect. We are going to put up signs everywhere telling people that a new stop sign is coming up, and people being what they are,

58

♀

I am sure some folks will still miss it and go flying right through it. So --

MS. REACKHOF: We are going to have flag people out, though, correct?

MR. FORD: We will have flag people initially, but it is going to be unmanned after it is established. We won't have flaggers out there all the time. It is designed to work without flaggers. So please be careful.

That is it for the commissary. The 1065 Corrective Action Plan update. Harding Lawson ESE is now working on updating the CAP. In fact, we are having a meeting with

them, I believe, next Monday afternoon to go over what is going to be in the CAP draft that is going to be circulated for stakeholders to review. We haven't actually got an issue date yet. I am guessing that it will be probably late June when it comes out for people to look at. It depends on a lot of factors. But we will be shooting for a date something like that.

And this project is still on schedule for fall 2001 cleanup assuming that we can get the draft CAP finalized over the course of the summer. So as we get a little bit closer to issuing the draft CAP, I will have a better -- a more precise schedule to give you so that people will have an idea of when it is coming out, and you can all plan to

59

♀

cancel your vacations so you can read the Corrective Action Plan for the mini CAPs and the tank projects.

We have Geo Resources helping us with that. They are drafting up a master work plan that will describe the procedures that we will use for the vast majority of tank and mini CAP sites, and that will be circulated as a draft next month. They are also -- as they finish that, they will begin work on the first nine mini CAP sites which are mostly in the big old buildings on the northwest side of the parade ground, including Building 102 where the Park Services offices are.

We also added Building 951 into it because that is a site where the Army took out a tank, but they left some contaminated soil in place. The Trust is interested in leasing out Building 951 for some type of dormitory housing

or something like that, and they want to do it this summer. So we want to make sure that we button up the site, do any additional cleanup that needs to be done before the building is turned over to a tenant.

We are also -- we are finishing up our internal review of a draft Petroleum Plan. The Park Service will then get a chance to look at it, and after the Trust and the Park Service agree that it is good, we will send it out for everybody else to review, which we hope will be towards the end of this month. So please wait by your mailboxes.

60

♀

This is partly in response to the question that Sam had asked that he pointed out or helped us realize that we don't really have a listing -- we don't have a good listing of all of the petroleum sites and the approximate order that we intend to attack them. So that is what this document is going to provide, and people can then, once it is finalized, you can use it as the check list.

MS. REACKHOF: It is more like a letter report thing. It is not a huge plan.

MR. FORD: It is a short text, four or five pages of text, and then there is a table that lists the roughly 485 petroleum sites that we have on the Presidio and gives a capsule of the status of each one of the sites.

And just looking ahead, out of about 485 sites, the Army -- we think the army cleaned up roughly 235 of them to the extent that nothing else needs to be done except get regulatory closure, that basically we don't need to do anything more. That leaves roughly 250 sites where we

think we will probably have to do something else. It won't always mean digging something up in each of those 250 cases, but I think in a lot of them it will. So sort of gives you a flavor for how much work there is to be done here. The petroleum program deals with a very large number of small sites, so it is kind of a big data management and

61

♀
†

scheduling problem.

Criissy Field Closure Activities. We are trying to wind up down there. The skeet range, we have a draft work plan, I guess it is a draft work plan out. DTSC has told us they are going to have some comments on it. We welcome anybody else's comments. We are assuming that the work plan is fairly close to what we actually need to do, so we are trying to schedule some of the follow-up activities which include a little bit more sampling, which we hope to do in the last week of this month when we have some very low tides. And we are focusing on trying to get bids to do the excavation work roughly in the last week of June when we also have very low tides that occur in the daytime. So that is on schedule to actually do the cleanup towards the end of June.

Criissy Field Closure Sampling. We sent out a draft plan to stakeholders last month, so I know all of you have been using that. When you wake up at 3:00 and you can't sleep, you pull out your draft Criissy Field Closure Sampling plan, and that knocks you out. We want to collect comments on that. And we are hoping to actually do the work, which would consist of sampling of the banks of the

marsh, to close out what was called Fill Site 7, which was the former -- it is the Army landfill that now has the marsh on it.

62

♀

And it also involves installing about 15 monitoring wells and doing some shallow soil sampling in what is now the West Bluff Picnic Area and parking lot because the Army had buildings there that they knocked down, and they did quite a bit of cleanup, but they didn't do sufficient closure sampling in all the cases. So I think we are going to go back and put in some wells and do some sampling to try to put those issues to bed.

What we hope is to get the work -- the closure sampling plan finalized so we can do the work in, say, mid July to mid August.

This, I think, is my last slide. This is the Landfill 4, Fill Site 5 Interim RAP. You all knew it as the Treatability Study. We have been having continuing discussions with DTSC, and basically the Treatability Study idea was not working the best from their end, so we all agreed that it would be better to term the project an Interim RAP, which I think in terms of the overall paperwork requirements it is about the same. We are just putting different labels on the documents now.

Treadwell and Rollo has been hired, and they are putting together a draft work plan and a draft Interim RAP. They are writing it chapter by chapter and sending chapters off to us so we can review it and the Park Service can also review it. We hope to get a draft together late this

63

♀

month. It has all the chapters in it for everybody else to take a look at it. Both the work plan and RAP will be circulated for people to review.

We are still targeting the start of fieldwork in October of this year with the goal of finishing the removal of Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 by the end of 2001. And then in early 2002 we will write the reports about it. So we're working hard on that project and it is still on track. But you can't call it a Treatability Study any more. It is now the Interim RAP.

Any questions? Do we have any more slides?

MS. REACKHOF: You are done George.

MR. KERN: Thanks, George.

MS. PACKARD: I wanted to remind everyone about the bi monthly meeting next Tuesday, May 15th, 10:00 a.m., at Building 1750, one week from today.

MS. REACKHOF: We will be sending out agenda information.

MR. KERN: Comments, Number 8, from Bob and Jim, if you have any.

MR. BOGGS: Couple quick brief ones. I think most of my stuff has been talked about by everybody. The Treatability Study/Interim RAP, my boss's boss kind of made that decision primarily on the basis that a Treatability Study can be approved by our department

64

♀

independent of the public process. And what we are really

hoping to achieve in this Treatability Study is not only get the information from the Treatability Study, but to clean close two land fills. And so it is most likely going to result in clean closure of two land fills. Our department wanted it to be done following the guidelines that include public participation. That was primarily the reason for doing that is just to keep it in the -- consistent with the CERCLA process. It is not going to change what is being done and what the end result is going to be.

As far as the groundwater monitoring, that has gone well. We have had some meetings. They responded to our concerns very fast. I think that went very well.

Crippy Field Skeet Range, that letter came that close to getting out yesterday. It will be out tomorrow. DTSC's concerns or comments are very minor. We are just adding a couple of things as far as their plan didn't include visual indicators that was in the previous Crippy Field RAP. So if they see lead pellets, they have to dig them up. Minor things like that.

The Crippy Field Closure Sampling, we have reviewed that, and we need to get together and have a meeting to discuss a couple of the things. The sample locations, a couple of them I scratched my head about, and probably you

65

♀
†

could explain about those, and that could be very fast.

I think that is it. You have heard a lot of what we have been doing with the background metals and working on that, so I think things are going well.

MR. PONTON: Very happy that the groundwater
Page 58

0508rab.txt

has been sampled, and I think things are going well.

MR. KERN: Thanks to you guys.

Any new business this evening? Action items? Number of reports coming out, I think I noted that you were expecting comments back maybe on the Fill Site 6 reports, okay. Any other action items people had tonight?

We are trying to have another meeting for the background metals next week. We are trying to wrap that project up. Hopefully it can be done at another meeting.

MR. NELSON: The removal action plan.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Mountain Lake report.

MR. KERN: Okay. Agenda items, Mark, he is out of town this week. So he will be back in a couple of days. So we can get any agenda items over to Mark for the committee meeting. And we will keep that process going, try to get all this good stuff, keep it on track.

Any other comments or announcements tonight?

Without further ado, meeting adjourned. Thank you for coming tonight.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.)

66

♀

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Bob Boggs, EKI

Edward Callahan

Bruce Castle, EKI

Julie Cheever

Dennis Downing

0508rab.txt

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Matthew Fottler

Doug Kern

Michelle King, EKI

Scott Miller

Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

Jane Packer, Presidio Trust

Jim Ponton

Kate Poole

Sharron Reackhof, Presidio Trust

Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

Tracy Wright

Gloria Yaros

---o0o---

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

7:18 p.m., Tuesday June 12, 2001

Golden Gate Club -- Presidio Building 135

135 Fischer Loop, Presidio of San Francisco

MR. KERN: Good evening everyone, and welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. This is a mid-year meeting in June. Welcome everyone, and hope you are planning lots of good holiday activities. Thanks for coming out tonight in the beginning of the summer.

I would like to welcome the Presidio Trust, the National Park Service, the Trust consultants, members of the community, the community RAB members, and particularly any members of the public here tonight who are just out to see the RAB in action -- the Restoration Advisory Board in action. And perhaps you are here to look at the group's workings, and perhaps become a member. So, we welcome everyone here tonight.

Does everyone have an agenda? Are there any changes, additions, modifications at this point? If there are along the way, we will work from there.

Any announcements? I see none.

We will move on to committee reports and Mark.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Good evening. We had our regularly scheduled Planning Committee meeting on the

22nd. And it was a shorter meeting, I believe. And we discussed most of the ongoing work that is happening and investigations coming up. So, we had a discussion on Battery Howe Wagner, Landfill 6, Mountain Lake, and the Landfill E protected range. And we had some discussion of membership issues. And we had talked about the new roster and E-mail update. And that was it.

Our next meeting will be on June 26th, which is the fourth Tuesday of the month. I hope you all can make it. Thank you.

MR. KERN: I would like to ask Jerry Anderson if he would to make a few comments. I know he attended a meeting, on behalf of the RAB, based on the Contingency Plan.

MR. ANDERSON: The Trust had set up a meeting last week to go over aspects of the Contingency Plan, and the Removal Action Work Plan, and the Implementation Plan. And, so, there were people there to explain, pretty much, every aspect of it. And I was there as the only community member of the RAB. So, I would like to really apologize for having gotten all this information -- and they were kind enough to provide it all -- and then this is the first opportunity I have had to share the information. But I would like to go over,

2

♀
†

as briefly as possible, a synopsis of my understanding of what is happening. And if I have got it all wrong, I am sure somebody will straighten me out.

In the first place, there has been a Contingency Plan. The Trust has been working on a Removal Action

Work Plan, and they have also released an outlying synopsis, whatever they may call it. And they have an Implementation Plan. These are all related. The Removal Action Work Plan is a plan that they have been working on to replace the Contingency Plan. So, when they have the Removal Action Work Plan there will no longer be a Contingency Plan.

The issue to be addressed by the Removal Action Plan is how to -- under what circumstances, and how it will be carried out to address contamination found at construction sites. Construction wouldn't have to be putting up a building, but it might be rerouting utility lines, or putting in a new road, or whatever. And if contamination is found during this activity, then the Removal Action Work Plan would provide a means for giving an exemption to removing that material without going through the normal planning and public review process.

The exemption that would be afforded by this plan would be restricted to the material that is -- would come within the footprint of this action project. If, for

3

♀

example, you did you go into a corner of an otherwise unknown dump site, only the material that was within, say the immediate construction footprint, would receive this exemption. The rest of the material to be treated with the full planning characterization and public review that any other site would be.

There are two aspects to the exemptions. One is to allow the project to go on. The other is exemption from

public scrutiny is partly in recognition that the only -- the only action available under the plan would be the complete removal of the material. Therefore, there would not be any lesser alternatives if they want to take advantage of the exemption. The Trust was putting together this plan. And in the process of advice and review, and consultation, DTSC decided that the plan was fairly good on describing the conditions, and that it would be appropriate to this implement this action. And it is, sort of, setting the scene for the process, but it was short on details of how it would be carried out. So, they asked for a more detailed plan, which led to the development -- or the process which will lead to development of an Implementation Plan.

So, the Removal Action Work Plan would become the overall same setting document. And there would be an auxiliary document -- the Implementation Plan -- that

4

♀

would say how they would have to do this. Well, in the discussion last week it appeared that this was kind of awkward, and an inefficient way to produce the documents. And there was a lot of support for making the Implementation Plan simply an appendix to the Removal Action Work Plan. That way you wouldn't have to duplicate material from one document to the other because you could just reference, you know -- if you wanted to see the background for this procedure, see paragraph 3.1.2, or whatever in the parent document.

So, I don't know if there was any commitment to do it that way, but at least that was sort of a consensus of

the group that it would be done that way. A lot of the discussion in the meeting was on how they might define the area eligible for the exemption. How many yards away from the contamination should it be? How many feet away from the building foundation could they avail themselves of this exemption? Conversely, it might be said in terms of the number of yards of excavation, what should that number be?

And, I think, those aren't -- those criteria aren't settled yet, but will be at some point in developing the combined document. There was one issue about public involvement. Although it is an exemption, the process in the normal public review, in a memo Doug, had asked for

5

♀

notification to the community members of the RAB. And the Trust was concerned that this might place, or his suggestion might place, an undue burden just in trying to track people down.

But I think the consensus of the meeting, if I am reporting it correctly, is that there could certainly be something worked out, especially the computer transmissions, fax, or E-mail. There is really no significant work involved in multiple addressees on such communications. And the personal communication, that might take more time, could be limited in some mutually satisfactory way. That is pretty much what I got out of the meeting.

MR. KERN: Great, Jerry. Thanks. And thanks for attending that meeting on our behalf. Any questions

Rab61201.txt
for Jerry? Any comments? Thank you very much.

Any other things that would fall primarily under the committee reports at this particular time?

MR. BERMAN: Just a small point on Jerry's discussion. It seems as if there was still a final RAW to come out -- I mean, guidelines were not completed. So, I guess I can ask anyone here, or Jerry, was there a date set for the final document?

MR. ANDERSON: I didn't hear a date. But they are intending to distribute it when it is available.

6

†

When that would be, I don't know.

MS. REACKHOF: Potentially, the draft will be available some time in late July.

MS. KING: Late July. I think the schedule -- we actually did hand out a schedule at the meeting, a milestone schedule. And I think it was going to go to the Trust in early July for review.

MS. REACKHOF: I have that it will be available after July.

MS. KING: Late July.

MR. KERN: It is an important document to comment on because, I think you know, the Trust needs the ability, when they find contamination, to move rapidly. And we are trying to maintain some input into that process. So, it is a good document to have some comment on. Thanks again, Jerry. Anything else?

MR. BOGGS: If I could add a little bit, really this is the opportunity for the public and everybody to get involved in the decision process for this. We are

actually requiring this document to go through public review sequence as if it were the cleanup plan for a site. Another thing to understand is this is only for unknown unsuspected sites.

I.e., if they are doing construction, and they happen to run into something that nobody knows about, if it is a

7

♀
†

listed or suspected site, it is carried into the existing program that we have all been involved in. And, as Doug said, this is an important document for you to review. In particular, there are going to be cleanup levels.

And one thing to stress is that when this document is implemented, the only thing that can be done is, they are going to dig up and remove contaminants to these cleanup levels. So, understand that really what the alternative is that is being evaluated is excavation and off-site disposal. And when this document gets finalized it does, kind of, remove the public from later involvement when they happen upon some unknown contamination. So, this really is your chance to comment on how the Trust addresses areas of unknown contamination.

MR. KERN: Thanks, Bob. Moving on then to Item Number 5 and Sharon for the Project Status Update.

MS. REACKHOF: Thank you. I will be doing the status update today. Chris is on a personal time off. So, we will start out -- actually, the first one we had was the Contingency Plan meeting. I want to thank Jerry. You did a great presentation. It was really a productive meeting, and we look forward to getting everyone's

Rab61201.txt
comments incorporated into the document. The draft is due in late July.

Field investigation activity, I was going to try to

8

♀

give a brief overview, to give some of you who might not know where we are going, and idea of what is going on. We have completed trenching activities at Battery Howe Wagner. Michelle King will be presenting an overview of the sampling activities, following myself.

The sampling results are now available in the draft report, which is under review by the Trust and the Park Service. We also have been conducting sampling activities at Fill Site 6. We are awaiting comments from regulatory agencies and the RAB at this time. We issued the document for your review.

Background metals, we had numerous meetings on background metals. I know all of you have been involved in those. I appreciate all the input on those as we go through it. The information that is contained in all of the meetings and has come out of all these meetings is going to be in a document called the Development of Presidio-wide Cleanup Levels for Soil and Sediment Groundwater and Surface Water. And it is under review by the Trust and the Park Service, and will be going to the regulatory agencies and RAB following our internal review process. That would probably be sometime in mid-July.

The draft Feasibility Study document that we have all been waiting for is going to be released sometime in August, and we will allow the stakeholders to review our

9

♀

process on that.

Some of the other activities we have are the Small Arms Firing Ranges, RI/FS ranges. For this site we have five firing ranges. We will look at Barnard Avenue Protected Range. This seems to have dropped out of the Army's eye, and was never picked up again. So, we decided the best place to, actually, look at viewing the data and doing sampling activities and closing it out was during the activities for the overall firing range documents. Treadwell and Rollo, our consultants, have begun reviewing a lot of historical documents in terms of site walks, background data review, and work plan preparation. We are pretty much underway and will be providing a strategy on how we will move forward with these activities in the next upcoming RAB meetings.

Building 215, as you know, the Trust maintenance crew was out doing some work, and discovered some oily soil. The 215 area, actually, is in the investigation of the final FS. And we collected samples. We did find some elevated concentrations of some chemicals. We issued a draft plan to the stakeholders in May, which is for all of you to review. We had anticipated to do this in, sort of, a phased approach, and to investigate the former UST pit where the prior underground tanks. We also were thinking of doing, maybe, some GeoProbe work for direct

10

♀

push sampling in the contamination areas, and backhoe

work to excavate the contamination. However, based on some comments that were received today during a meeting with the stakeholders, we are actually trying to assess whether we will move forward with this at this time, or wait number the FS is completed. And Bob Boggs from DTSC will be looking at items related to that. We will get you an update at the next working group meeting as to how we are going to be handling this site.

These are just some pictures that we took, actually, some of the trench sampling and initial characterization at the site.

So, that is pretty much the main activities that I know you have all been hearing for some time. I just wanted to get everybody updated for those of you who might not have remembered where we are at. I know EKI will be presenting an overview of the Battery Howe Wagner activities and the carbon tetrachloride. But, actually, Doug, I was wondering if we could continue with George, since we have two different computers.

Are there any questions on any of those past activities? If not, without further ado, George, go ahead.

MR. FORD: The groundwater monitoring program is chugging along. We finished sampling and elevation

11

♀
†

measurements. Next month we expect to get an interim draft report for the Trust and the Park Service to review, on or about July 18. And we will be working to get that thing finalized pretty quickly, since the next round of sampling is scheduled to start Monday, August

20th. So, that is where it is.

For Mountain Lake we got our initial response from the Army. Not surprisingly, they sent us back a letter saying that they don't think it is really their problem, which was disappointing to us. We were hoping they would send us a check to pay for the cleanup. But it didn't turn out that way. So, the Trust is talking about the Park Service -- and we are trying to figure out what our response is going to be. We had a strategy discussion with stakeholders this afternoon, and we got some input from DTSC on what they would need to see in order for them to participate fully. And we will -- the Trust and the Park Service -- will be taking that back and forth, and trying to come to agreement on how we are going to go with this.

And as I mentioned last time, the plan is to move Mountain Lake back into the Main Installation FS. And there is where the alternative analysis will be done. Any questions on that one?

MS. CHEEVER: Is the Public Health Service

12

♀

Hospital in the Main Installation?

MR. FORD: Yes, it was in the Main Installation. Then it moved to --

MS. REACKHOF: It was in the Main Installation, and then entertained the idea of doing the ROD Amendment. And we also thought that might be able to move quicker if it was included if Graded Area 9, Lobos Creek, and Mountain Lake because we felt they were sort of the

footprint, and all could be handled in the ROD amendment activities. However, the decision was made to not move forward with the ROD Amendment. So, we moved them back into the FS, and closed it out as part of the final FS.

MS. CHEEVER: So, that applies to Graded Area 9?

MS. REACKHOF: Graded Area 9, Lobos Creek, and Mountain Lake, which were all originally in the RIS.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER NO. 1: Are there any environmental issues at Mountain Lake, or are you talking about the jurisdiction of the cleanup investigation?

MR. FORD: Actually, there are the Trust -- I want to go back all the way in history. But, basically, there were some indications of possible lead contamination in Mountain Lake. The Trust did some sampling in January of this year, and analyzed the samples for all kinds of metals, and some pesticides, and

13

♀

some other organics. And we have found that the uppermost couple of feet of sediment on the lake bottom have elevated metal concentrations. We suspect that some of the elevated lead concentrations may be a result of runoff in the road from Park Presidio Boulevard, which runs right on the west side of Mountain Lake. So, there are contamination issues there.

MR. BERMAN: Where is the sampling going to be done for the Mountain Lake?

MR. FORD: August. Groundwater sampling is base-wide. We have 115 wells, or something like that.

MR. BERMAN: So, that will be a repeat of the
Page 12

same sampling sites that were in the previous sampling sites?

MR. FORD: The same ones we finished in May.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Sam, the quarterly sampling changes each quarter. It is the same overall wells, but not every well is sampled every quarter. So, it is not exactly the same ones, but it is the same general group.

MR. ANDERSON: Would it be easy to characterize the Army's excuse?

MR. FORD: Well, yes. In a nutshell, the letter that the Trust sent to the Army says that, based on our reading of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Army and the Trust, we think that the Army is responsible for

14

♀

the contamination. That interpretation is made based on -- there is a clause in the Memorandum of Agreement that says if anything is found that results from a road, like a CalTrans road or right of way, is considered unknown contamination.

And when you discover previously unknown contamination, the Trust can go back to the Army and ask for assistance or more money. The Army wrote back saying -- I don't remember the precise details, but they have a different reading of the MOA, and they do not regard the contamination as being unknown as defined by that agreement. So, they don't think they are responsible.

And the Trust isn't planning to leave it there. I think we will probably send them back a letter that

Rab61201.txt
provides additional backup for our view of why they are responsible.

MR. ANDERSON: And this was not in their inventory of sites, right?

MR. FORD: I believe --

MS. REACKHOF: Well, Mountain Lake is a site. And we did note for the MOA that there were some slight concentrations of chemicals in the lake. So, it was an FS site. So, it is a known site.

MR. O'HARA: George, what led you to believe

15

♀

that the concentrations of lead were the result of runoff from the highway?

MR. FORD: Well, I think there were several lines of reasoning. The first, and probably the most basic one, is the pattern of occurrence that, basically, the lead concentrations get higher, generally speaking, as you move towards the west. We also sampled the actual storm drains that lead from Park Presidio Boulevard into the lake, and the highest concentrations of some of the metals occurred in the sediments in those storm drains. So, that -- I mean, in a nutshell, that is the main argument.

There has actually been a large amount of work done on the analytical concentration of metals to see if some of them grew, to see if they are related to Serpentine sediments in the lake. But a nutshell, I think the pattern of occurrence of certain metals generally points the finger towards Park Presidio.

MR. O'HARA: Making a leap here, assuming that

you go through the cleanup process, what preventative measures will you take to keep it from happening again?

MR. FORD: Probably, at some point in the process, CalTrans is going to need to divert their drains so that the storm drains don't flow into the lake. Whether they do that voluntarily, or whether regulatory

16

♀
†

agencies causes them to do it, that will be established. But most likely, I think the storm drains would be collected into some kind of a pipe and run into the sanitary sewer system, which is more consistent with most of the storm drainage in San Francisco. Most of it runs into the sanitary sewer and storm drain system.

MR. O'HARA: One minor question, from a protocol standpoint is it the Trust's contention that, because there is the occurrence of lead there, the Army has some blatant responsibility for the discovery, the subsequent discovery of it being there? And did you see the recourse against CalTrans, or where does the responsibility ultimately line up?

MR. FORD: Well, I -- in the real world, that will be established by negotiation. If I were just looking at it strictly in terms of the language in the MOA, the MOA gives the Trust -- we can go back to the Army and say, "Hey, you need to send us some money." And whether -- when we sent them the letter telling them that we had this problem, we outlined for them the fact that we think that CalTrans may be involved, and that they should probably be talking with CalTrans.

But as far as the MOA goes, I don't think it specifies how the Army would deal with CalTrans. It is more just the Trust submits a claim to the Army, and then

17

♀

the Army, in a perfect world, would either pay or go to CalTrans and say, "Hey, you pay." And, of course, it is not a perfect world. It isn't going to happen exactly like that.

MR. O'HARA: I understand that. So, it is really a negotiated settlement then. Would the Trust ever go after CalTrans if the Army doesn't?

MR. FORD: It is too soon to say.

MR. O'HARA: But that option is available to you?

MR. FORD: I believe it is. And I think it is -- one thing we can say pretty clearly is the Trust does not regard this as an obligation that we have to fund through our allocation money from the Army. We think we should either be getting some extra money from the Army or CalTrans. We really don't care which one. That is our position.

MR. ANDERSON: Is there a thought that this lead contamination is continuing. I would have thought that since they removed lead from gasoline, that the lead would have been deposited many years ago, and would not be continuing.

MR. FORD: That is what I would have thought too. So, I would have to say we don't know. We do know that some of the highest lead concentrations are in the

18

♀

sediments in the catch boxes for the storm drains. But we haven't gone out and sampled on the road. So, you know, we don't know whether it is just left over in the drains, or whether it is still coming down. So, time will tell.

MR. BERMAN: Just on that point there, I think in the metal discovery there were additional metals that could be likely associated with tire remains.

MS. KING: Zinc.

MR. BERMAN: So, even though lead is removed from fuel it is still there, even though other heavy metals are still in the tires. So, I think that you would still have to do something about the drainage to deal with the materials from the tires. I think that is the picture you gave us at the previous meeting.

MR. FORD: I believe Zinc, copper, and cadmium in the tires are typically indicators of tires.

MR. ULLENSVANG: So, a sweep of roadway metals found the lead from past gasoline, copper, and cadmium from tires. So, it seems to fit the pattern on the roadways. All those metals were concentrated primarily on the western side, and appear to be elevated in the drains themselves.

MS. YAROS: But was the lead primarily from gasoline, or -- only from gasoline, or overall from

19

♀

tires? You talked about that, I think, two weeks ago, or

three.

MR. FORD: I would say that the best evidence seems to point towards the roadway as being the primary source for lead. We can't say that every molecule of lead that you find in that lake definitely came off the road. I mean, there just isn't enough data to make that kind of interpretation. But we feel reasonably confident that the pattern of occurrence, and the way the metals correlate with each other, that most likely the lead did come from the road.

MS. YAROS: Right. But, specifically, what element is coming from the roadway? Is it just the gasoline, the lead in the fuel?

MR. FORD: That is formerly the most -- that is formerly the main source of lead that you find heavily used on roadways. And we are not aware of any other big lead sources in the neighborhood. That is part of the reason.

MR. BERMAN: On the question of paying for this, since it is now been put back into the Main Installation FS, then is it your intention to move on, pay for it, and eventually collect back the money from those people that you can get it from?

MR. FORD: I would say that is our initial

20

♀
†

thinking as we have talked with DTSC just today. It is just that we have some choices that we need to make. And I think DTSC's preference would be that we not run out and do a cleanup, and then try to involve the other parties and DTSC in a discussion about who should pay.

Their view is that if we want other -- if you think that other parties have to pay and bear some responsibility, then we have to bring them into the discussions early on.

So, one of the things that will be happening in the Trust within the next few weeks is we will talk about that. Do we want to take the risk of going out and doing it on our own and arguing about the money later? Or does it make more sense to bring all the potentially responsible parties into a room and discuss it from the beginning? And I don't know how it is going to go.

Okay. The Commissary, we finished digging finally. The backfilling is going on. It will take another week and a half or so to backfill. We took out roughly 3,300 tons of contaminated soil, gasoline, diesel, motor oil. It was a big pile. And we expect to do the final repaving and restore the road in the first week of July.

So, that project is moving along and headed towards completion. Any questions about that one?

MS. WRIGHT: I wanted to ask what it looks like at this particular time. Do you think you got the

21

♀

source?

MR. FORD: Yes. Everything, all of margins of the hole in the bottom, all met our cleanup levels. And, yes, we got the source. I think it has been a successful project.

Next one is 1065. 1065 cap, this was another topic that -- or another site -- we talked about this afternoon. We discussed with some of the stakeholders

the issues of when we should collect additional data, and when what should be done prior to the corrective action, or what could be done as part of the corrective action. And we have some things to think about, so the Trust and the Park Service will be putting our heads together and discussing it a little more over the next few weeks.

This slide is probably out of date. I can't actually -- if we could go back. I don't -- at the moment I am not sure we will have a Draft CAP available for review next month. We have to have a few more discussions to see about that. We may be on schedule for a Fall 2001 cleanup, but that schedule may also need to change. So, by next month we will have some more coherent thoughts on this topic and a better idea of what the schedule really is.

The Mini-CAPs and the tanks, we have got our first set of write ups for the Mini-CAP sites to include the

22

♀

historical barracks buildings along the main parade ground. And we are doing the interim review. And hope to be working on those, probably, in August -- actually working in the field.

And we are still working on Draft Petroleum Program Plan. It was supposed to come out last month, but I am still not finished with it. So, it will need some more finishing touches. And we hope to get it out soon, although I don't want to put a specific date on it.

The skeet range, we are chugging along on that one. We did the preexcavation sampling, what we hope is the last round of sampling there. It was begun late last

month. The data is just now beginning to trickle in. We are now looking at excavation and removal on the beach, probably, in July. One of the reasons for that is that when we finally got around to doing a detailed cost estimate -- the job is probably expensive. It is just that we need to go through an invitation for a bid process, which is what the -- it is the procurement method that the Trust has to use for jobs that are expected to cost more than about \$50,000. And that takes a little bit longer.

So, right now we are shooting for some low-tide periods between the 18th and 25th of July. So, we should -- next month we should be able to report that

23

♀

that job is about to start.

Crispy Field closure sampling, we also discussed that project this afternoon, and we have a tentative start date of June 18th to put in soil borings and monitoring wells. This is another one where we are going to be discussing it over the next few days. So, I can't say for sure whether we will be drilling on June 18th, but we will see. We are going to hope to hold to that start date.

For the Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 Remedial Action Plan, the project team is meeting weekly. We have been told that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will require a formal consultation. That is a process that we go through where they look at the endangered species that occur in and around the project area. And in this case,

the endangered species are an issue at Fill Site 5, right next to the hillside where there is Ravens Manzani ta and clarkia (sic). I don't know if there are any other species. Basically, it is a biologically rich area, and Fish and Wild Life is concerned.

So, it is possible that the Fish and Wild Life consultation may affect our schedule. We have been shooting for starting digging at this site in October. It is possible that if the Fish and Wild Life consultation is not complete by then, we may have to

24

♀

delay the start of working at Fill Site 5 a little bit. We don't think the Fish and Wild Life consultation will affect Landfill 4. So, that should stay on schedule for starting work in late September. And this is another one where we should have a draft RAP available for people to look at in the middle part of next month.

MS. MONAGHAN: Is Manzani ta an endangered species?

MR. FORD: Yes. They occur not in -- they are not within our work area, but they are right next to it.

MR. TOM ?: This is just kind of a heads up. This one will be coming back up. We expect to be starting some field investigations at Landfill 10 sometime this summer, probably late July or August. Landfill 8, field investigation should follow up in the fall. And the Trust and the Park Service are going to continue their discussions about, really, the process. The Trust and the Park service aren't on the same page about how we handle this project administratively. So,

we are going to be continuing to discuss that. But we thought, in the meantime while we are discussing what to call the process, we could get started with it. So, that is why we will be doing some field investigations. I think that is it for me.

MR. KERN: Any questions for George?

25

♀
†

MR. BERMAN: A couple of questions. With the skeet range are you planning to use barges at all for the removal?

MR. FORD: Not on this one. The job is small enough I think it makes the most sense to use heavy excavating equipment on land. So, we are not planning to use the barge. Most likely it will be a large excavator. And they would load the soil into trucks, and take it down the Promenade, and then off of the Presidio.

MR. BERMAN: Second question, looking at the places where the action may occur on the RAW, do you think that the petroleum cleanups are the most likely places where this kind of problem will arise, since there are so many small ones the likelihood that they have all been characterized carefully enough? So, I am just guessing that that is the place where most of the action on the RAW is going to be.

MR. FORD: I think I remember right. Just in terms of -- I actually counted the number of listed petroleum sites that occur in the various tables we got from EKI and the Army. They are 484 listed petroleum sites. So, there are just a lot more of them than CERCLA

sites. And I am sure that will be reflected in the use of the Contingency Plan.

MR. BERMAN: So, your plan just -- sorry to go

26

♀

back to the RAW again, but are you going to separate out your contingencies for the petroleum sites from the CERCLA sites?

MR. FORD: Well, the Contingency Plan will apply to both. It is just -- we use different cleanup levels for them depending on what we encounter.

MS. REACKHOF: It is just the setting up of the process, and how we deal with the contamination. But they will be handled the same.

MR. BERMAN: So, if most of the action is going to be around the petroleum sites, then it is just essentially a little more digging and removal, which would normally probably be agreed on, in most cases, by public review. Anyway, I am kind of guessing on that.

MR. FORD: Yes. Well, I would say on small petroleum sites, the really small ones, sort of, never make it onto the public radar screen. We find them, dig them up, and get rid of them sometime between RAB meetings. I am sure that will be in a gray area there on what sites are big enough that people might be interested in commenting on them. But I think that most petroleum sites are small, and they are shallow. And they really do lend themselves to fast remedies of digging it up and getting it out.

MR. BERMAN: One final question, it is my

27

♀

understanding that the Public Health Service Hospital is going to be opened up for temporary use by the Muni-center while their new building is under construction.

MR. FORD: I think at one of the -- there is the main large building. I don't think that will be opened up. I think there are several little satellite buildings over on the east side. I think the Jewish Community Center is going in one of those little ones. Sharron, do you know?

MR. KINGSTON: Yes, they are going in 1802.

MR. FORD: That is one of the smaller buildings that are is the east side. But the main building, as far as I know, there are no plans to open it.

MR. BERMAN: So, is that fence going to be opened up, then? Right now it is completely fenced off and not open to the public.

MR. FORD: I think the main building is going to stay fenced off, but the buildings around to the right will be.

MR. BERMAN: So, you don't expect that will cause any interference with any of the proposed actions?

MR. FORD: No, I don't think so. I mean, for the PHSH, the big issue sites are Landfill 10, which is to the west, and Landfill 8, which is up, you know, on

28

♀

the next terrace level and back. And the buildings that

are being leased are, in respect, close to those. So, we hope there won't be any conflict.

MR. KERN: Any other questions for George?

Thank you.

We need to switch computers, and we are roughly, I think, halfway through. So, we will take a little five or ten-minute break, and we will reconvene. Thank you.

(Break taken from 8:06 p.m. to 8:25 p.m.)

MR. KERN: I did want to thank everyone again for the outstanding turnout tonight. This is a really great showing. And, generally, August is a month where we have pretty low attendance, due to vacations and things like that. But as you can see by the schedule, and the agenda that we have had, there is just going to be a lot more actual activities ongoing throughout the year. There are a lot of things scheduled for September, October, November. So, we are probably going to convene, on things that, you know, need continual input through the summer. So, if you can make it, please come to the meetings.

We are now ready for Item 5B. And that is the Carbon Tetrachloride Investigation Plan -- Battery Howe Wagner. And that is Michelle King with EKI.

MS. KING: We start with the trenching results

29

♀
†

we did at Battery Howe Wagner. And Sharron alluded to these in her, just general, update, because the report is in internal review, and will be released, probably, in the next few weeks. That is my guess on it. And the trenching work was done back in mid-April. And we got

the results, you know, sort of, in the May timeframe. And, I think, in some of the background metals' discussions we actually had gone over some of these results. So, a few RAB members have actually seen these before. So, it is a little bit of a repeat for a couple of people.

But, basically, the tactic was to put in six trenches, numbered over here on the left to 100, and then moving across the Battery all the way over to 105 on the eastern end of the Battery. And, you know, the objective of the sampling was to better characterize the nature and extent of the fill out there. Because from the Army's boring logs, sometimes it is very difficult to tell how much debris and such is really present. Because you are talking about a little 2-inch or 4-inch hole, whereas a trench allows you to see so much more out there.

And one of the things we were also interested in looking at is, we observed debris in a borehole all the way off to the west. And we used the old cul de sac, which was filled in. It was this brown area. And we

30

♀

wanted to see if there was a connection between these two areas. And the fill extended all the way across. That is part of the reason we had test pit 100 where we did the trenching.

These are pictures of some of the trenches. And I apologize for the darkness of the trees and all that. It was a nice day, but it can be difficult to see. This is TP 100. It is that western one. And the hole there is,

like, right there. There is a brick fragment, basically, that we observed in about the upper five feet or so. Ten to twenty percent were fragments of some brick and rubble.

The interesting thing in this test pit is when we got down to 7 feet, there was an old brick and cobblestone road that was there. And that was about a foot thick. And once we went through that road there was no more debris or anything observed. So, it looked like when the cul de sac was operating before the filling, the old route was outside the cul de sac, and the filling happened on top of it.

Now, moving one trench over to the east, we have Test Pit 101. And in this test pit the amount of debris dropped off. I think it was about less than 5 percent brick in the shallow soil. And this is the stock pile from the trench. And the thing is you can see the, sort

31

♀

of, darkish-colored grayish thing. They found, like a, burned tree stump at the bottom, down at 11 feet. They brought it up, and it broke into pieces. There wasn't all that much debris. It was probably evidence of the historical filling of the cul de sac. And this is actually looking down in the trench, and you really don't see much. I mean, the bottom line is, a lot of these trenches are pretty clean. And if you have on the order of 5 percent or less debris, you don't really see all that much. The stock pile is a better place to look.

Moving over to the next one, Test Pit 102. This is relatively in the middle of that cul de sac area. And

there was some debris encountered in the upper part of the trench -- again, 5 percent. So, it is similar to the neighboring one, but when we got down 2 feet, that is where we started to see significant amounts of debris. In fact, it was like solid wood debris. There was very little soil. You can just see, coming from the back, some more jaggedy looking things. I know it is hard to see from a distance. This is where we started getting into the wood debris. But this piece of concrete came out of the shallow end, and there are a few other bricks, and some rubble. So, there was some stuff. And then at 9 feet we pulled out wood to 12 feet. You can see how much wood really was there. I wasn't out at the site,

32

♀

but my understanding is that the bottom of the trench looked like a wood pile down there.

MS. CHOW-WINSHIP: What is it?

MS. KING: The assumption is that this was a driving cul de sac at one point, and then these attached areas were old buildings. What we think happened was when they demolished the buildings in place, they put them in a big pile there. There are other, sort of, buildings up here, and across the street. And they were probably all demolished around the same time. Did they get dumped in the cul de sac and get it filled in? We don't know, but that seems plausible.

MR. BERMAN: On that point, this wood is probably older than 50 years, right? And it is still in pretty good condition?

MS. KING: I can't remember if the filling took place in the '40s or '50s.

MR. BERMAN: It was right after World War II.

MS. KING: That I don't recall. Honestly, I don't remember. I can see if I have it in here. It had to be after World War II because the actual cul de sac occurred in around 1940. So, it would have been later. So, sometime after World War II, but I don't think we know when the filling took place.

MR. BERMAN: So, is it a surprise that this wood

33

♀

is so well preserved?

MS. KING: No. I mean, wood decays pretty slowly if it is not sitting in wet muck.

MR. BERMAN: So, it is actually redwood?

MS. KING: I don't know what the type of wood it is, but it was down 9 feet. And the bottom of the cul de sac -- this is, sort of, the deepest part of the Battery. I think it could be 26, 27 feet down. So, it is probably that, you know, more than 15 feet, or about 15 feet, of debris there. So, it was pretty significant. That is the high point.

Then moving on to the next test pit. Moving now -- again, to the east. This one had less debris and rubble in it. It was -- there are maybe a few bits and pieces you can see off in the stock pile. And it was -- of all the trenches this one had the least amount of debris. It was like 1 to 3 percent. When we got to the deeper part of it in the 8 to 12-foot range, there was no debris observed at all. There was quite a contrast where you

had all this wood in the neighboring trench, and there was not much here at all. This is another picture of the stock pile.

Then 104, moving again further to the east, this trench had, my records indicate, about 5 percent debris in it in the shallow end. And then and 6 feet down there

34

♀
†

was a change in soil color. You can really see it in the stock pile. I don't know how much it will show up. This is a real dark black color. This is a rusty brown. So, at 6 feet there was a definite soil change. And then around 8 feet or so there was more debris, 5 or 10 percent debris. So overall, you know, the debris content is fairly low. It is mostly soil with the exception of the central area.

The last test pit, which was all the way over on the eastern edge of the Battery, had a road that was uncovered, an old, asphalt road, just 3 feet down. There was no rubble observed in the shallow soil. We hit a road and we couldn't penetrate it with the backhoe. So, we weren't able to go underneath it. You can see the scraped up asphalt. And in this one it is hard to see, but there is a little bit of asphalt there from the backhoe trying to scrape through it. So, it looked like at the eastern edge of the cul de sac we were close to the original grade with a small amount of top soil placed over that area.

We did testing at each of the trenches except for this last one because we didn't observe anything in the

shallow soil that was suspicious. But from each of the trenches we collected two soil samples that were composite soil samples from several different depths in

35

♀

the trench, and analyzed them for metals and volatile chemicals. And the only volatile found was the chemical carbon disulfide. And it was found in extremely low concentrations very close to the detection limit.

The lab said they were estimated quantities that were detected in two of the locations, 101 and 102, and the deep samples. And it is unclear whether there was really a true lab problem with it, or if the carbon disulfide is real. And as many of you may recall, there is some carbon tetrachloride at the site. We didn't see any carbon tetrachloride in the fill. So, in the volatile analysis, and under certain very unique conditions, you can actually have carbon disulfide as a dissection product of carbon tetrachloride.

In this case I don't think that the carbon disulfide levels were so low, but we can't completely discount the results because the lab didn't say they had too much trouble. They said, "We are saying they are not valid because carbon disulfide is a common lab contaminant." They do use it as a solvent. It is suspect, but we don't want to deny the fact that the carbon disulfide could be related to the carbon tetrachloride.

The findings in the metal results were a little more interesting. What we found is there is a concentration that exceeds the cleanup levels. We have just gone

36

♀

through the consensus process with the agencies to come up with that number. And, basically, these five metals are nickel, cadmium, lead, et cetera are the chemicals of concern at the site. And the places are -- the places where there was the most debris and rubble found -- and in particular the sample with the big wood pile at 12 feet. It had lead at 820 minimum grams per kilogram. And the cleanup level is 10 here. So, it is fairly contaminated, and it is at depth. And, generally, when we had very little debris, sort of, the 5 percent or less, the metals concentrations really were very much in the range of background.

So, overall in, sort of, interpreting this, we start out by saying Test Pit 100 was, sort of -- do we join it with the boring off to the west with the Battery, given that we saw 10 to 20 percent debris and the cobblestone road which looked like the old ground surface that we had this area attached now? But I think we will say that it is part of the overall site, and that it does connect one thing. We are thinking about looking at the boring logs on the eastern end where we hit the road down at 3 feet and didn't see any rubble if other boring logs from the Army suggest that there seems to be evidence that that roadway does extend in that area.

And, so, it is unlikely that the true debris fill

37

♀

extends fully to the east. We had some metals above

cleanup levels at the two low indications. The metals have to do with lead, paint, and debris in test pits. It could be some arsenic. It could have been treated with the wood. It could have been some of the higher arsenic -- it looks like it extends a little more to the west than we originally thought. But, on the other hand, the eastern portion may be able to pull in a little more based on the test pit observations.

That is it for the trenching. Do people have questions on that?

MR. O'HARA: With this information what will the results show?

MS. KING: I think -- I mean, the results show -- if you come into this with the Army results, that is the one thing that is missing. We didn't post the results from the Army. And, really, the Army didn't find -- when you actually look through, and do QC on the Army's data, there really were no chemicals of concern that came up out of the Army's investigation. So, because we have this correlation of where you have more debris, the concentrations seem to be a bit higher. But, on the other hand, the site seems to be fairly well covered. So, you know, in that shallow soil there is really not much contamination.

38

♀
†

So, the original tactic in addressing this site is if the source of the carbon tetrachloride in the receding groundwater -- if the source is in the fill, you want to excavate the source and get rid of it, because it is causing the groundwater problem, albeit a small

groundwater problem. But it is a problem if the carbon tetrachloride were coming from the upgraded source. We just had some elevated levels of metals. And people aren't going to be exposed, and ecopopulations aren't going to be exposed. It might make sense to leave it in place. I don't feel there is a strong reason that it should be removed.

But, I mean, I think the FS process will sort of work itself out. The Trust has not committed on a remedial action. But at this time, I would say leaving it in place, assuming the carbon tetrachloride isn't coming from the Battery. It doesn't like it is coming from this fill.

MR. O'HARA: How would you treat this site differently than you would a landfill site once you got this contamination at some depth, but you really don't know?

MS. KING: I guess the difference of a landfill site is the belief there is more than just building debris at the landfills. The filling at this site was

39

♀

believed to be done, you know -- as we were saying, you know, this is, again, sort of, a one time fill. It wasn't an ongoing operating landfill where there, you know, could have been municipal waste and other things disposed in the fill. And it was, sort of, a one-time fill. From the evidence it looks like it is building debris and soil. So, that is why it is really not a municipal solid waste landfill.

So, I view it as being it is close to Fill Site 6. If you look at Fill Site 6, that was -- that filling was, again, tied with building demolition, sort of one shot of soil and building debris. And, you know, there is no evidence of a municipal waste disposal.

MR. O'HARA: If the conclusion is that there are specific concentrations of contaminants, would you zero in on those and get the parameters of what those contaminants were in terms of extent, and then focus on that as your clean-up target, as opposed to a general tackling of a site?

MS. KING: I think -- I mean, it would be the same sort of approach in the sense it is applied to the fill site as it would to Battery Howe Wagner if you think about these results in their individual test pits. And here we had two out of five locations that had elevated metals. But I think the concern would be that you could

40

♀

move 50 feet to the west and find contamination, or you may not. And because it is, sort of, a heterogeneous situation, I think it would be, perhaps, a little bit short sighted if one went in and tried to address these two consolidated areas. We wouldn't say that the five trenches we put in were fully characteristic of the entire site.

And so one could, you know, in theory take the area where all the wood debris is, and say, you know, "Does it make sense to focus on that particular area?" And, you know, perhaps, yes. I think, then, the question becomes, when do you stop, let's say, addressing that area? Is it

at 10 percent debris? Because I think -- I don't know. I am not making much sense here, but it is hard to know when you have excavated enough to say, "We have gotten the bulk of the debris." My concern would be that it does extend beyond the few test pits we put in.

MR. O'HARA: So, would you dig more test pits?

MS. KING: At this point I think we could propose a remedy on -- assuming -- I would say you have to assume you treat the area as a whole, where we are going to extend the site a little to the west, and probably a little on the east, and treat it as voluminous. One could presumably do some cost estimating, and say -- let's assume the volume has a

41

♀

number greater than 50 percent debris -- I will throw out a number as X, and you can do that in the evaluation for sure.

MR. BERMAN: Let me engage Peter here as a fellow RAB member. As lead is stable and 9 feet down, and the proposed remedy is a cap, and presumably there isn't any reason to think that there would be any hazard associated with that. Therefore, it would seem that would be judicious not to do the excavation in this case, but to actually cap it because it is stable and very deep?

MR. O'HARA: Where is it in relationship to the water table?

MS. KING: The water table, generally, in the area, like where that wood debris is, is beneath the

bottom. It is deeper than 28 feet in that area because you have gone below the cul de sac into the native elements. And when the borings in that area -- they hit Serpentine when they drill down. And, generally, it seems like the groundwater is flowing along the Colma and the Serpentine. So, it is deeper than the bottom of the cul de sac.

MR. BERMAN: Much deeper.

MS. KING: So, it is dry. It should be dry. There really isn't all that much water up there. We had

42

♀

a hard time finding water when we were drilling, but it seems like it is in fractured flow. And primarily between the contact between the underlying soil and the bedrock, we don't see a lead problem in the water there. The carbon tetrachloride is the one thing that is there. The cleanup level is a half a microgram, a half-a-part per billion. And the highest part we see is 2.

I can go into this presentation if people are ready for it. So, just as a reminder, we didn't see any carbon tetrachloride in the soil samples that we collected in the trench, which is consistent with the Army's investigation.

And here the objective really is, we have this carbon tetrachloride that has been seen in groundwater, based on the fact it doesn't look like it is coming from the fill material. It essentially is the unknown. What is the source? And there were many upgradient of the Battery that had a historical use that could have used chemicals such as carbon tetrachloride. So, we were trying to find

an approach that we could look for carbon tetrachloride in a, sort of, broad-screening approach, that is very sensitive. And there will likely be follow-up investigations for what we are proposing. We wanted to get broad coverage to tackle where the source is.

So, just going back over the data of what we know

43

♀
†

about the site, the groundwater appears to be flowing, sort of, to the northeast. That big black arrow -- that is what the water elevations tell us. If we actually look at the distribution of carbon tetrachloride it has been detected in this well. It is upgradient of the fill material at 2 and a half and 2.7 micrograms per liter. The drinking level is .5. We see it here at the downgradient level. These levels are low, but they do exceed the standards.

These other three locations, the carbon tetrachloride was not detected. So, it looks like, based on the chemical distribution, that water is flowing to the east, because we had clean numbers down here, and cleanup here. It is possible that you could have a plume coming in. And we are seeing the two edges of the plume. That is a possibility. It is a possibility that we are seeing the two sides and the heart is right down the middle that we are missing. But given we have bedrock and the flow is occurring along this contact, what we measure through water level elevations may not be the actual path that the contamination will be flowing in groundwater.

So, as a result, we are doing our historical records

review. We focused on a broad sweep of buildings, because we didn't want to strictly go off of this is upgradient number. Let's look here. We said, "Let's

44

♀

take a broader look at what could be influencing the source of carbon tetrachloride." So, we went to the archives. We used -- I guess, Mark, how many years ago was this, nine, that you put that together? Mark had gone through the archives IT, and had done a follow-up report. And then we went over to the archives ourselves, and just tried to identify the various uses of the buildings, and where there been carbon tetrachloride.

So, we found a couple of buildings. The buildings in blue are the ones that are very unlikely to have any kind of chemical use -- barracks, offices, residences. The yellow buildings are buildings of possible chemical use. They are more storage, guardhouses, post-exchange-type buildings. There could have been some chemical use at those buildings. And then the pink ones are the ones that have the most likely chemical use. And the one thing I want to point out is Building 1233, which was a paint storehouse, there was a record of carbon tetrachloride being spilled at that building location. And there are actually two reported spills. One was carbon tetrachloride.

We put -- there was a well right next to that building. That building came out clean in the investigation last year. So, it is one of these things that there were these maintenance shops here, you know,

45

♀

some carpentry and machine shops. There potentially was a gas station. It showed up on one of the historical maps. There are no other records of the gas station. There are other areas where it could be used. But Building 1233, the paint storehouse still remains the prime suspect in my mind because it had a known release. But the well right next to it is clean.

I should also point out there was an underground tank on the other side of that. We don't know where the history of the spill was exactly. When they pulled the tank, they could have removed the source of the carbon tetrachloride. There also was an underground tank in this area as well. So, those are other areas of concern.

MR. ANDERSON: Carbon tetrachloride is normally dissolvable in water. Do you know what concentration that would be if you had carbon tetrachloride in contact with water?

MS. KING: The solubility, I am guessing -- just based on my memory, it is up on about 1,000 times higher of a milligram per liter, or 1,000 micrograms per liter, if not higher, for carbon tetrachloride. All these chlorinated solvents have a very low solubility in water. But for carbon tetrachloride it is at least a milligram per liter.

MR. BERMAN: A number of these buildings that we

46

♀

looked at are not in the FS. Is that correct?

MS. KING: That's correct.

MR. BERMAN: So, if there are -- if you eventually find contamination associated with these buildings, is the plan to include them in the FS?

MS. KING: I think the tactic, actually, would be to look for -- let's say we find the source. Let's make it this building over here. And we find that that looks like that is where the source is. Clearly it is not associated with the Battery, and so that building would be addressed separately. The Trust has a vehicle called "Miscellaneous Sites." It would be a likely place to give it a home. And there is no reason to hold off the Main Installation FS for this one building. But if, you know, this investigation points to a clear operating source, then that would be addressed separately. That would be the plan.

So, we are doing -- let me go to the next slide. So you can get a better sense, all these stars are where we are proposing to sample. We are trying to do a fairly broad coverage of these buildings, focusing primarily on the pink ones that seem to be in the potential upgradient direction. And, Bob, this building up here, 1231, we just got comments from DTSC on. We provided the RAB, and DTSC, and the Regional Board a preliminary map and tables

47

♀
†

of what we are doing. They requested we put samples up there. We will be doing it. The map may change a bit based on the comments.

I have here what is called a Gore-Sorber. We are going to use this technique. I am going to pass it

around. Basically, it is a sock or sleeve, if you will. And then at the bottom of it there are sorbers that are made of it is carbon resin that they use in labs to collect solvents. So, the Gore-Sorber stops water vapor so just the soil gas goes in. They go in the ground 2 to 3 feet, and create a little hole with a little probe. And there is a probe that you hammer the cork in, so it is flushed with the ground. And you let it sit there for around two weeks. Over that two-week period it collects -- if there are any solvents it will collect all the solvent material. And each one comes with a jar that is labeled. And you send it into the lab, and then they analyze it. And what they measure is mass. So, it is mass of solvents that culminates on the sorber.

So, it is not a technique where you can correlate -- let's say you have got, you know, 3 milligrams of carbon tetrachloride on the Gore-sorber. You can't correlate that to a soil or a concentration. That is why it is a screening technique. But because of the way it sits in the ground so long it is very, very sensitive. So, we

48

♀

are really likely to find the source if it is findable. If we don't really see any significant carbon tetrachloride, then, I think, we can be fairly confident that there is not this big smoking gun out there.

We debated on using active soil/gas and active soil sampling. We thought this would be the best technique because it is the most sensitive thing out there. At the end of the two weeks you use a corkscrew.

MR. BERMAN: Is there a chance that you could end up not finding the source because these are not deep enough?

MS. KING: You can use it when groundwater is 50 feet down. And you can often see it with these, you know -- no. And the assumption is that the release was probably a shallow release somewhere as well, but we are including one location that is close to the well. We have the 2-and-a-half micrograms per liter to see if we can measure something on the sorber where we have a low concentration in the groundwater. And we may not see anything.

MR. BERMAN: Would you calibrate your Gore-sorber against that one?

MS. KING: Hypothetically, you could. And if we have more locations with hits, then that would tactic would be to do that from one point.

49

♀

MR. FORD: Generally, you just compare it with the results to each other, and you contour them.

MR. BERMAN: But since you have a measurement, somewhere it might be a calibration. So, you get a meaningful number out of it other than the source itself?

MS. KING: It gets compound. If you have stuff in silt makes it harder to predict. I think if we have higher hits than what we see in groundwater you can try to correlate it. That is partially what this is used for to find an appreciable pathway for groundwater flows.

MR. ANDERSON: I had a related question. And I wondered if the presence of carbon tetrachloride vapor

wouldn't depend on the characteristics of the soil in between -- I don't know what the vapor does, but would it be absorbed onto the surface of some soil particles, and not if it were a different type of soil?

MS. KING: You would form some kind of an equilibrium of some absorbed on the soil, some in the water. If you have a clay soil then you would have a higher organic carbon content, which means you would have, in theory, more carbon tetrachloride adhering to that soil. But, similarly, because it attends to concentrate it, you could end up with potentially more in the soil gas that is adjacent in that same core volume. It all depends on the mass and where the release is.

50

♀

MR. BERMAN: But, in any case, that wouldn't affect the use of this as a mapping device?

MS. KING: That is it exactly. You end up with this color map that is sort of red where the highest concentrations are.

MR. ANDERSON: Is there an exception where you may not find it, and it may still be there?

MS. KING: Like I said, it really is the most sensitive technique around. You could try other sampling techniques, but because this is in the ground so long, I think it is the best shot to find the source.

MR. ANDERSON: Why not pound a pipe down 25 feet, for example, and then install this thing 25 feet down?

MS. KING: I don't think it gives you any better

results if you are down to 25 feet, because, I mean, the source is approximately some kind of a surface release or release from a tank.

MR. ANDERSON: But that is from a long time ago. So wouldn't you think that the carbon tetrachloride would be down at, or below the water level?

MS. KING: I don't think we know even if it is in the water table. You will see it if we have 2-and-a-half here. And if you had 250 somewhere upgradient, you could see it in the soil gas with this

51

♀

technique. They are claiming now -- the vendor is claiming -- we are going to see the 2-and-a-half in the soil gas. I am not 100 percent convinced we will. I don't know if we will, but if we come up with -- if you don't see it where there are 2-and-a-half micrograms per liter, and we do see it someplace else, it would suggest there is a higher concentration than 2-and-a-half in the soil. So, the approach would be after we get these results back, assuming we see a hot spot.

MR. ANDERSON: What is the content of there being 2-and-a-half in the water? Does that mean the water has to be in contact with pure carbon tetrachloride somewhere?

MS. KING: Not necessarily. I mean, it could have leached.

MR. ANDERSON: What is the possible scenario?

MS. KING: How much actually leached into the water table from the original release could be a very, very small release, that could result in 2-and-a-half

micrograms per liter in the groundwater.

MR. ANDERSON: If it happened a long time ago, and the water is moving, then whatever got to the water a long time ago, one would think, would be washed clear. So, if there is still stuff there, does that mean there is still a higher concentration source of the material

52

♀
†

somewhere that is not moving?

MS. KING: I don't think we know. It all depends.

MR. FORD: That is where we are headed. We are trying to find that out.

MS. KING: There either could be a plume of it, or -- I mean, I doubt, honestly, there is a pool of free-based carbon tetrachloride anywhere, because we would see significantly higher concentrations. And one point I do want to make is we didn't extend the historical survey farther to the west, because you hit the Fort Scott Parade Ground that has been there since the '20s, or '30s, at least.

Looking at the historic maps, the primary carbon tetrachloride use would have been used later. These chlorinated solvent plumes are known to travel a long distance. If you go down to the Silicon Valley there are plumes more than a mile long. It could there be something coming from the other side of Fort Scott. I would say it is fairly unlikely.

MR. ANDERSON: You said there were records of spills. Are there any indications of the volumes of the

spill?

MS. KING: I don't believe so. I don't think so. I can check though.

53

+

MR. BOGGS: I think on one of the reports there is an indication.

MS. KING: I can't remember if it was a volume spilled of carbon tetrachloride, or what. Okay. It was a 40-gallon release of liquid and sludge, including xylene crystalline (sic) acid and benzene. And then -- that was in 1986. And then in 1987, there was a work order request for cleanup of a 35-gallon spill of a degreaser and 55-gallon paint stripper, and some other type of crystalline acid. So, there were two reported spills in the tens of gallons.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

MS. KING: So, just -- also, the other thing to point out is that we have included some locations throughout the Battery itself. There was a motor vehicle repair shop that was located in one of these buildings, actually in the old cul de sac. We have a sample location there. That was one of the things that Mark had brought up at one of the meetings we had. And, so, we are trying to get a sense of the distribution across the Battery. And, hopefully, having some that at background levels at -- well, if we find the smoking gun source, it is nice to see a distribution to go down to background levels as well. This describes the Gore, which I already said. So, that is it.

54

♀

Any more questions?

MS. YAROS: Could you tell us again what the level for drinking water is?

MS. KING: The level of carbon for drinking water is .5. So, the highest we have seen is 2-and-a-half. So, it is five times the drinking standard in one location.

MS. WRIGHT: Can you tell us the timeframe for the Gore-sorber samples?

MS. KING: The work plan is being reviewed by the Trust and Park Service. We are just getting some comments back from that. So, it should be coming out for review, probably, in the next couple of weeks, I guess. We would have a plan out for review. Then it is going through their process of project review to be able to go out and do it. So, like I said, the samplers are in the ground for two weeks. Then it takes two to three weeks to get the results back. That is the one disadvantage of this method, that it is a little slow. It takes about a month before you actually see anything back.

MR. FORD: I would add one more thing. When I first heard about Gore-sorbers I thought it was a goofy technique. But we looked into it in some detail when we were trying to do our source location and screening work at the Commissary. And there is a lot of evidence that

55

♀

suggested they really do work. And it is -- we have

concluded, down at the Commissary, that it is a great technique to use in a case like this where the groundwater is 15, or 20, or more feet down, because you don't have to spend a lot of money getting down to the groundwater.

We didn't use it at the Commissary because most of the stuff we were looking for, we knew was probably within 6 feet of the surface. So, we could get at it very quickly with the drill rig. But for this kind of a situation it is, like, what they were made for. I mean I would expect a pretty good result from this technique.

MS. KING: It is also very hard to -- like I said at the beginning of the talk, the groundwater isn't all that prevalent up at the Battery Howe Wagner. One of the wells that we installed last year was dry. And we really haven't gotten much water out of them. So, another tactic would be what George was saying, do a bunch of groundwater samples. You could a lot of money on drill rigs, and time, and not collect too many samples. So, this tool will help us more focus on it.

MS. MONAGHAN: How much is one of those?

MS. KING: I think they are about \$200.00 to \$250.00. And that includes the analysis. So, they are, actually, fairly cost-effective.

MR. ANDERSON: Are they a one-time use?

MS. KING: Yes. And I don't know if you felt it. In each one there is like three or four little sorbers in the bottom. You will you get a duplicate or triplicate. So, it is one final use, but at least you

get duplicates of the data.

MR. BERMAN: So, is this the first time you have used the Gore-sorber for any work?

MS. KING: At the Presidio I think it is the first time, but we have used a whole bunch of them at SLAC, and at several other sites. SLAC is another federal facility.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe the Army used them at 1065. So, a number of years ago they did at 1065.

MS. WRIGHT: Is there anything you have to drill down? It is not like a pipe you put down?

MS. KING: No, just this little guy goes down. There is a rod that inserts it down into the hole. And the hole is sort of like the size of a dime.

MR. BERMAN: It would be interesting to stick one right near the well where you discovered the carbon tetrachloride and/or maybe a couple of them just see how quickly you can gather information when you have something which is already above cleanup levels.

MS. KING: Actually, it is interesting because

57

♀

Gore recommends that you have to go at least 15 feet away from a well. So, we can't go right next to the well. I think that recommendation may come from -- you have a filter pack around the well, and you could have, maybe, some short circuiting where you will have diluting soil gases going through it. They recommend you go 15 feet away from it.

One of Bob's other comments was -- he recommended

that we put two locations just downgradient of the well. So, we are, kind of, surrounding that well, if you will. In terms of the time -- I mean, do you pull it out after five and ten days? You know, they recommend keeping it down there 10 to 15 days because it increases the sensitivity of the method. I would be worried if we are going to see anything like the 2-and-a-half.

MR. KERN: Anything else on Battery Howe Wagner? Thank you, Michelle.

Sort of moving on to Item 5F. This is an item that I essentially would like to introduce tonight as sort of an emerging issue, not something that necessarily requires a lot of discussion, but really more of an introduction in the context of the larger program. I think you are sensing, hopefully, we have gotten through another major milestone with review of the background metals. That was a lot of work. There has been a lot of

58

♀

discussion around remedies for a variety of sites. And it was announced that, hopefully, we will get the release of the draft FS sometime in August. So, all those good things are happening.

And with a variety of removal actions being proposed, it seems appropriate to begin to discuss things like the remediation program schedule and financial reporting in a little bit more detail. I think we have a potential now for really connecting with the schedule that will come in some fashion to us with the discussion of the FS. And that is going to be a very important part of these package of remedies, how quickly will they be rolled out,

and what is the success, what is the priority. And I think it is important we had the opportunity to review those schedules.

In the past it has been a little bit more in the abstract. Now things are coming a little bit clearer, perhaps of what is the full package of items we are really going to be working on, and how are we going to really approach those things. And with the beginning of actually doing those items there would be more money spent. And, I think, potentially there will be a significant ramping up in expenditures. So, I also think it is appropriate that there be some opportunity to have a regular review of what is being spent.

59

♀

So, I have sent around to RAB members some ideas about this -- an E-mail. And I have been counseled by various RAB members on how to approach that. And that is kind of what I am going to talk a little bit about right now. I think the feedback that I have received is that people would like to discuss internally, and develop our own process and position around these subject areas that are really important to RAB members around the remediation schedule. How can we appropriately and constructively influence the program schedule? What is important to us with regard to financial reporting? What kind of frequency; what kind of detail; what kind of level of effort would we like to see?

And I think, rather than prescribe any of that tonight -- and it is more important that people begin to

consider that this is now heading into a more earnest phase of what is scheduled, and reporting significant impacts on the park, and significant impacts, I think, on how the program unfolds, doing things with a certain care towards learning from early actions, and folding those experiences into later activities. I think that is going to be a key part of how this works.

And, similarly, I know that we have -- we are looking at Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4's removal action as a way to gauge expenditures of funds, and how quickly various

60

♀

things can occur. So, I think just by way of introduction, I think this is an emerging issue that we should begin to discuss among ourselves. And we should begin to ask each other questions about what we would like to see, and at the same time engage the staff along these lines to see what kinds of input and feedback they would like to give us.

So does anybody have any comments, given all that explanation? Any thoughts at this particular time? Very good. We will try to proceed along some constructive path with regard to the schedule and financial reporting. Let's move on to Item Number 8. That would be Bob and Jim, if you have any comments, updates, or input.

MR. BOGGS: Pretty much what we have been working on has been discussed tonight, as far as the Contingency Plan, Building 215, Battery Howe Wagner, Crissy Field, Mountain Lake, Building 1065. One thing that is coming up is -- I have been working on the CERCLA documents for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. So, those are

probably going to be drafted to the Trust and the Park Service next week so that then they can be revised and go out appropriately with planning for public review. That is it in a nutshell.

MR. KERN: Very good. Jim, anything?

MR. PONTON: No.

61

♀
†

MR. KERN: Any new business items? Anything that would fall under the category of any other announcements that have come up during the meeting?

Action items? There are probably a variety of documents that we could comment on.

Agenda items? One thing that I would encourage that we get on the agenda is a follow-up. It occurred to me during the meeting tonight. So, I don't intend this as a surprise. But it occurred to me that with Battery Howe Wagner we were discussing we weren't quite sure what the remedy might be that. There are probably a handful of sites like that where we have done additional investigation, additional sampling, and that those installation sites we probably should revisit and discuss, as we have other sites in terms of remedies prior to the release of the FS. That would be my recommendation, that we schedule some meetings on discussing remedies for any of those outstanding sites. That is one agenda item.

MR. BERMAN: Doug, but as I understand it, some of those sites are now being further investigated with sampling, right? So, in fact, there has to be some type

of order for this discussion, because there will be new information coming from 8 and 10 with some new sampling, right?

62

+

MR. KERN: Well, it is interesting. Landfill 8 and 10 are, kind of, in a special category. They are part of the Public Health Service Hospital. They are not really contained in this Main Installation FS. They are important sites that we need to understand remedies, but I think they are, kind of, in a different part.

MR. BERMAN: Okay. You want to confine this to those that are in the FS?

MR. KERN: I think so.

MR. BERMAN: And there is no new sampling of any of those sites, just as a matter of clarification?

MR. KERN: I think we just talked a little bit about this sampling at Battery Howe Wagner.

MR. BERMAN: Right. That seems to be outside of it. Most of it is outside.

MR. KERN: My understanding is that it is part of the site. Now, I don't know if we are going to find the source off the site. I don't think anybody knows exactly how that is going to go. But, nevertheless, this site, Battery Howe Wagner, is part of the FS, and we should talk about how it is going to be handled, or broken out, or whatever. And for those sites, where we haven't come to some group consensus, I think we should just go down the list, check it off, and have a discussion about fill sites prior to the release of the

63

document. I think 8 and 10 is a separate discussion there that also warrants discussion.

Any other items tonight? Any agenda items, of course, go to Mark through the usual channels. And seeing no further discussion or announcements, thanks for coming tonight, and for your participation. Meeting adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.)

RAB MEMBERS

Jerry Anderson

Sam Berman

Bob Boggs, EKI

Julie Cheever

Dennis Downing

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Doug Kern

Jan Monaghan

Peter O'Hara

Jim Ponton

Sharron Reackhof, Presidio Trust

Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

Joanne Chow-Winslip

Tracy Wright

Gloria Yaros

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

July 10, 2001

p.m.

---o0o---

MR. KERN: Good evening everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. I'd like to welcome everyone here tonight. The Presidio Trust and their contractors, National Park Service representatives, community RAB folks, members of our regulatory community. And there are potential RAB members in the audience. We'd certainly like to welcome you here tonight. If you of any questions, please feel free to grab us at a break or after the meeting and talk to us about any questions you might have.

Does anyone not have an agenda who needs one? Are there any additions, changes, modifications? Speak now. Any announcements? No? Make your reports.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Good evening. We had our regularly scheduled Planning Committee meeting on June 26. We meet at Building 1750 which is down by Baker's Beach and Willows Creek.

The topics we discussed on the last meeting were the Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 draft Interim Action Plan which is being

VFRA3

1272

proposed right now. The Building 1065 Remedial Action Plan, we discussed that. It's in draft preparation right now too. We had a discussion of schedule and finance by Doug Kern, and we ended up with a discussion of Landfill E, which is a large landfill in the Presidio. That's an ongoing topic of discussion at RAB meetings and committee meetings.

Our next Planning Committee meeting will be on July 24th which is the fourth Tuesday of every month. It's a regularly scheduled meeting. Please attend if you feel like it. Thank you.

MR. KERN: Any questions of Mark? No? Let's move ahead to Item 5 with Chris Nelson on the Project Status Update.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Doug. For those who don't know me, my name is Chris Nelson. I'm an environmental remediation specialist with the Presidio Trust. I'd like to talk to you this evening about some of the projects that we've been working on under my purview.

First off, on some of the Presidio-wide projects that cover the entire Presidio, the Presidio-wide contingency plan, which is still underway, there was a series of outlines that were released a few months back. We held a meeting at the end of May to discuss the concepts with regulatory agencies and RAB. We had one RAB member present and National Parks Service was there. So we got some input from all the stakeholders on

that. And currently our contractor, Earl Cowanowski, is preparing an internal draft version of the document for review by the Park Service and Trust. And once we've had a chance to review the Contingency Plan and the Remedial Action Work Plan for contingency sites, they will be turned over to the State Board for review.

The Main Installation Feasibility Study. This encompasses approximately 39 sites throughout the Presidio. Under the CERCLA process or Superfund process, we're doing a feasibility study in determining the remedy on how to clean these sites up.

There have been a couple of field investigations this year that have occurred, and there are a few more planned under the feasibility study. The most recent was the trenching that took place at Battery Howe Wagner with soil sampling in April. We recently released the report to the stakeholders on those results. I've issued them tonight to the usual suspects. Bob I have yours here. And there are also copies in both of our libraries. And if anybody else needs a copy, let me know.

We also have released Fill Site 67 report which is from activities that took place in February; similar trenching and soil sampling activities in Fill Sites 6 and 11. And I have a feeling that people may be waiting until all the investigations are complete to provide their comments, but you're certainly welcome to comment on these documents as they come out.

Also along the lines of fill investigation, something that is that is being released tonight is a draft Sampling Plan for Soil Gas Investigation at Battery Howe Wagner. We've actually received some verbal comments from the State, and we were able to incorporate those comments. We also received some written comments from RAB on the concepts that we put forth in a meeting a few months back. So I'll probably be soliciting comments and/or approval letters in a few weeks if there are any additional comments on that. We'd like to be able to get in the field and look for a source of carbontetrachloride in the soil or groundwater as soon as possible to bring this information into the feasibility study.

There is also a plan to gather some additional data at four sites. As it stands right now, we should be in the field by late this year, October, November. The plan is to take the data and include it in the Remedial Action Plan for the Feasibility Study, assuming that the feasibility study is approved this calendar year.

The sites that are included are ones that were discussed with DTSC and other stakeholders in previous meetings this year when we were talking about background metals and screening for contaminants of concern. They are Building 1750, near Baker Beach; Building 215 in the Main Post; Buildings 1244 and 1245 in Fort Scott, and Building 1351 also in Fort Scott. These will be primarily soil samples; however in

some cases, there will be groundwater samples collected in the groundwaters present. And we hope to include this information in the RAP as well. When the FS comes out, we'll have some assumed remedies discussed, and then this characterization to aid in speeding up the remedies when necessary.

Also in the Installation Feasibility Study, the background metals and screening of contaminants has been released to the Trust and Park Service Review, and it will be released to the stakeholders in a document entitled Development of Presidio-wide Clinic Levels for Soil Sediment, Groundwater and Surfacewater at the Presidio. We're hoping that we can get the comments from the Park Service and the Trust incorporated into the document by either later this month or early next month to get it out to the public.

The draft version internally reviewed by the Park Service and Trust of the Revised Final Feasibility Study is currently in our hot little hands. Brian Ullensvang and myself are reviewing it, and we have plans to meet with Earl Cowanowski, the author, in a few weeks coming up here to discuss our comments. And we're hoping that we can get these comments appropriated in a document and put the document out for review in August or early September. So that's the plan for now.

I'm going to move on. If anyone has any questions --
MR. BOGGS: There is going to be a release of the

ARARs section? Is that anticipated for early release, or is it going to be delayed for a time?

MR. NELSON: The goal is still to get the early release out. It's kind of a race at this point. There are few issues that are still -- The lawyers are tinkering with them at this point, and when we get them fully tinkered, we'll release them. Ideally, we'll get them out within a few weeks. So I would say they would be out in advance of the FS itself.

MR. KERN: Just for the audience that may not be familiar, Bob and Chris, could you explain what the ARARs is?

MR. BOGGS: Applicable Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. It's basically an analysis of the various environmental regs, everybody from Fish and Game to the local zoo. They have to consider everything under the sun regulatory-wise and how it affects the remedies that are being proposed here. The ARARs section would be an analysis of those various regs and how they apply to those being proposed.

MR. NELSON: And ARARs are one of the nine criteria that are evaluated when a feasibility study is done. And so a remedy is compared against ARARs and other things, other criteria. So they are quite important to make sure that the remedies that are proposed are compliant with laws at all levels, like Bob mentioned.

We've been talking a lot about Small Arms Firing

Ranges. Recently most of the work has been going on from behind the scenes. We've been working closely with our consultant Trico Rollo, and some of the representatives are here this evening. We've also been working closely with the Park Service. And there is a work plan for the RFS that's currently under preparation. The goal is to present that work plan at a RAB meeting in the future, possibly next month or perhaps September, similar to what we did last spring with Earl Cowanowski presenting the work plan strategy for the feasibility study. So hopefully, we'll get some concerns aired and some input on the work plan process, so when the document comes out there won't be a lot of surprises on what's going to happen with that project.

And just for those of you who don't know, the Small Arms Firing Ranges -- At this point, sites that remain in the RFS process are five sites around the Presidio that have gone through the Superfund Screening Process, and they're slated for further investigation. So that's what this RFS covers. At a recent meeting we discussed Building 215. Soil contamination was discovered in April. Subsequently we submitted a draft plan to stakeholders regarding a proposal to do an interim cleanup. We received some input on that strategy, and basically the preference is to wait until after the Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan are complete to implement the remedy. So as a proposal subsequent to that,

we are planning to do the characterization work this fall, as mentioned earlier, and that will allow us to go out and do the digging and hauling away and actually have a remedy in place. Any questions on any of those things?

Moving right along. This is my last item. The Public Health Service Hospital Landfills 8 and 10. For those who of you don't know, the Public Health Service Hospital is located in the southern portion of the Presidio, near 15th Avenue and Lake Street. There are two landfills there, one being essentially at the parking lot at the southern end of the site, overlooking the Willow Creek area, and the other one being north of the main building there overlying the Marine Hospital Cemetery.

The plan at this time is to proceed with additional characterization of those landfills with the goal to get into the field by this calendar year. We've worked closely with the Park Service and our consultants to begin preparing the scope of the work for that activity, and our plan at this point is to evaluate our options at the end of the investigation phase, so we can know where we can proceed from there.

So at this point, the administrative track that we're following is yet to be determined. We plan to do the investigation and try and see how we can implement any changes that may be derived at those sites. Any questions on Building 215, Firing Range or Public Health?

MR. KERN: On the landfills at Public Health Service Hospital, that's great news to hear about the additional characterization later this year, hopefully in this calendar year. Would those sites be then incorporated somehow in the schedule of all the rest of the work?

MR. NELSON: I believe that is the case, yes. We have a public member confirmation from the audience. Any other questions for me? Thank you.

MR. KERN: The Groundwater Monitoring Program.

MR. FORD: Okay. I guess I'll start now. For those of you whom this is your first time here, my name is George Ford. I'm the manager of remedial construction for the Trust, which basically means that I'm in charge of digging holes and getting rid of bad dirt, and I'll be going over the Groundwater Monitoring Program, Mountain Lake, a few other projects that are continuing now, and then I'll finish up with a little more detailed discussion of what we're doing on Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, and where we think that project is headed. For the Base-wide Groundwater Monitoring Program, we're still on schedule to get out an internal draft report on July 27. I guess the data is still being validated, because there were, I believe, over 100 monitoring levels that were sampled in that. There's a lot of data, so the data validation process takes awhile.

We're scheduled to have a meeting on Thursday, this

coming Thursday, to discuss possible modifications to the next round, or subsequent rounds of the groundwater sampling. So some of those will be based on changes that we think might need to be made to our SAFQAPP, Quality Assurance Project Plan. And some of them may arise just from things that we've observed in the field when sampling the levels.

The next round of sampling is scheduled to start on August 20. So any questions on groundwater monitoring?

MR. KERN: Question on the report coming out. At the end of this month, we're going have a meeting to discuss what to do without the benefit of those results. Is there any -- since it's an internal draft, is there any information that we can get at this meeting to help us, guide us with this next round?

MR. FORD: I haven't thought about that, but I think the answer has to be yes. Clearly, we can't have much of a productive discussion. And in fact, I think the thinking is that Thursday we'd sort of kick off the discussion, and we'll need to continue. It's a fair point, that you can't really have a detailed discussion about changes to the program if nobody's seen the data yet.

MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the things we're trying to accomplish -- the time frame INAUDIBLE) so short to see what we can accomplish without the data. There are several things that I think we all acknowledge in going into this first round. Last time we knew more quite the way people

wanted to (INAUDIBLE) explore what those changes would be, and acknowledge that it's not optimal that all the data won't be there and go forward.

Some of the easy things will be (INAUDIBLE) which wells didn't purge the way they were expected to do. So those are some things we can talk about.

I think you brought up a couple sites where you had some concerns in the first round. We can certainly talk about those and try to settle several of those concerns regardless of what the data presume to show. I think that the goal is, particularly this week's meeting, realistically for most of the issues, and part of this is (INAUDIBLE) ground sampling, is to deal with it on a continuing data, and try to get back into it because this first round took a little bit longer because of the newness of the program in the laboratory. Hopefully the future program would not be as long.

MR. O'HARA: This is more for my own edification. What is the policy for the frequency of establishing data tables for monitoring of the wells?

MR. FORD: It's basically being done quarterly.

MR. NELSON: Not all wells are quarterly.

MR. O'HARA: And that's been a policy for quite some time?

MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. And that is traditionally what is done at monitored sites, to do up to four times a year in a

typical monitoring program.

MR. O'HARA: So it's up to four times a year, or it is scheduled for four times a year?

MR. ULLENSVANG: It's scheduled four times a year. I don't want to imply that every well and every site is monitored four times a year. That would not be true. But each site is in the rotation. Some sites because of past data may be sampled twice a year. These are part of the history of how the program developed with the Army. Not every well had every-quarter sampling. In some cases -- you can imagine that a more narrow sweep of testing analytes is included. Then once a year the window is opened up to explore other analytes, and it goes back down again. That helps with the evaluation of data and the management of the data and the economics mostly.

MR. O'HARA: You said that you were sampling or will present data from a hundred -- approximately a hundred wells. Does that mean that -- Obviously it means then that there are more than 100 wells out there.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe there are (INAUDIBLE) wells. And in the monitoring plan that is talked about, maybe three or four months ago here in the community meetings, there is a table that the goal is to list every well in that table and identify which analytes for which quarter. So It's a very convenient way if you wanted to talk about -- For each of us to have a copy of this table, and look and say, "This well at this

site is monitored in the first and third quarter for these three contaminants."

MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

MS. YAROS: That's what I was going to ask. Can you tell us just quickly the main contaminants you're testing for?

MR. ULLENSVANG: In general, I don't the table in front of me, or I could give you more specifics. But in general, there is what we call general parameters, measuring things like alkalinity, total (INAUDIBLE) solvents, nitrate and nitrate. Some basic water chemistry: Ph, dissolved oxygen. Some of the more conventional contaminants involve organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, organics and pesticides, dissolved metals, petroleum compounds. Most wells are not analyzed for all of those analytes. Some (INAUDIBLE) in which case, we know that at certain sites, petroleum sites, for example, once it's tested to demonstrate that there aren't other compounds there, may just include petroleum compounds. We monitor how those react in the water.

MS. YAROS: And are there things like lead?

MR. ULLENSVANG: Those would come in under metals. There is a list in one of the state regulations of a suite of metals and that's called Title Two Metals, and those are the ones that are particularly tested for planning in detail which metals those are, which analytical method we use to determine

those metals.

There are a couple of sites or wells that have variations to this suite. Some sites --You may recall (INAUDIBLE) we had a discussion on cyanide. Some sites have a potential for cyanide; others were determined not to. In some cases, the detection levels the Army used wasn't adequate to make a determination. So those have all been reevaluated (INAUDIBLE).

MS. YAROS: Thank you.

MR. KERN: Any other questions?

MR. FORD: Okay. Mountain Lake is the next one. The final report for the Seventh Investigation I believe was passed out this evening, so that's available for people to look at. The Trust would really like to complete the cleanup of Mountain Lake next summer. Doing clean up early next summer dovetails very nicely with the Restoration Program that's planned for Mountain Lake. So we expected to keep to that schedule.

We'll probably start doing some of the initial design work for the remedy, which we expect is probably going to be dredging out contaminated soil. And then that design work is going to start relatively soon, before the Remedial Action Plan for the whole base is prepared or completed. And we also expect that discussions between the Trust, the Army, Park Service, DTSC, and Caltrans are likely to begin pretty soon to

try to determine who will be paying for all the work out there, because there is right now a little bit of disagreement about who is financially responsible. But anyhow, we expect those discussions to kick off sometime in the next month or so. They will probably continue through the rest of the summer and fall.

MR. KERN: Can you give us any greater level of detail on how that has progressed? The last thing we heard was that the Army said "No" to your letter.

MR. FORD: Yes, actually I can say -- A few things have happened. The Army -- We sent a letter to the army giving our analysis of a Memorandum of Agreement. Our analysis indicated that the Army was responsible for any contamination on the Presidio. The army remains responsible for any contamination on the Presidio that results from Caltrans right of way passing through.

The Army read our letter and decided that they had a different interpretation. They send us a letter back. While we were crafting our response, the Army actually invoked the Dispute Resolution, the Management Level Dispute Resolution Provision of the Memorandum of Agreement. We were in that status, sort of a Code Red, for about two or three days, and then some managers in the Army and the Trust action talked to each other and concluded that starting the dispute resolution process wasn't necessary, that we were a little premature, and that we had some more talking to do before we starting

invoking dispute resolutions on each other.

So we're back to talking. And when we met last month to discuss this, Bob Boggs of DTSC laid out for us basically the scenario under which DTSC could best participate in the negotiations. And one of the things DTSC was interested in was to get all the parties to the table and discuss the issues early on, rather than have one party or two parties kind of decide what they were going to do, go do it and then present a bill to the third party and ask DTSC to help enforce payment. The Trust and Park Service discussed that internally, and we've concluded that, at least at the present time, what we think is the best system is to go the DTSC way, which is to try to get everybody in the room to discuss the issue before anyone takes any really extensive action. So that's the discussion process that we hope to kick off this summer. So we were in Dispute Resolution for a little while, but we're back out now. We'll keep you posted. Any other questions on Mountain Lake?

MS. CHEEVER: I think it's probably discussed before, but can you give us a general ballpark estimate about how much soil would be dredged out from the bottom of the lake? What portion of that soil would be dredged out under the Restoration Plan?

MR. FORD: I'm a little rusty on numbers, but I know the ballpark. If you were -- The areas sort of don't perfectly

overlap. There was a large area where we're discussing doing dredging to restore the lake. And I believe the volume of that area was roughly 11,000 cubic yards to dredge that area 4 or 5 feet deep. If you overlay the area that we know to be contaminated right now, it increases the total quantity of dredging to about 14,000 cubic yards. So it's a net add of roughly between 3 and 4,000 cubic yards when you add in contaminated soil.

If you go the other way, if you were to assume that there was not going to be any restoration dredging, and you were only doing dredging to clean up the contaminated soil, we think that that volume -- although it isn't really tightly constrained -- we think it would be about 8,000 cubic yards by itself, just for the cleanup.

MS. YAROS: And George, I'm just curious. Where does that go, the contaminated soil?

MR. FORD: We're still trying to figure out. We're guessing -- If you dredge it -- Unless you empty the lake, when you dredge it, it will come out as a slurry. It will be like the consistency of a milkshake. And what we'll have to do is dry it out because you can't dispose of a slurry at any landfill. It has to actually be a solid. So we will have to do some kind of treatment to it to get the water out of it, and once it's dried so that it's actually a soil instead of a thick liquid, we're guessing that it will probably be a Class 2 waste, which means it can't go

to a household-type landfill, like the one in Novato, but it could be disposed of -- There's a Class 2 landfill in Livermore, and there's also one in Stockton. We're kind of expecting after the slurry is de-watered and treated, it probably is not going to be a hazardous waste. It won't be bad dirt. But the other part of it is that we think it will be too dirty to be re-used anywhere on the Presidio. We're going to have to pack it up and haul it away.

MS. YAROS: Thank you.

MR. FORD: Is that it for Mountain Lake? If anybody has any questions about Mountain Lake, I'd be happy to talk to you after the meeting.

Now for the Commissary Interim Removal. That's a picture of me standing on the repaved road. So we've finished digging, the hole's backfilled, the road has been restored. We still have some odds and ends that we need to do to finish the project. We have to install three monitoring logs and sample them and analyze them. And we also have a report to write describing the work. But the main dirty portion of digging up the dirt and getting rid of it, that part's done. Mason Street is back to its original configuration. So that's where we are on that one.

MR. KERN: Just a quick question. Do you still sample those same seep areas?

MR. FORD: Yes. We want to sample the seeps to compare them to the monitoring levels, and also to see if the

seeps get better. I mean, the concentrations drop. You expect it to get better. Next slide, please.

The Building 1065 Cap Update. Right now the Trust and the Park Service are discussing the input that we got from the Water Board and DTSC when we met to discuss this last month. In a nutshell, the issue that that came up is that the Trust would prefer to proceed into the cleanup and sort of collect additional -- There are some areas within the site that we don't have a lot of detailed information about. And what the Trust was proposing was to start the cleanup and collect that additional information while the cleanup was going along. I think DTSC and the Water Board were both in reasonable agreement that that approach causes them some heartburn, partly because it asks them to approve a remedy, potentially sign off on a final remedy, when they haven't got a complete picture of what's going on in the site.

So we're discussing that internally, and we're trying to decide whether we are going to argue some more, or whether we're going to go out and do the additional characterization and stop arguing. At the moment, I'm not quite sure how that's going to go, but it will be decided shortly.

vAnd I guess I would say that we also solicit opinions and comments. If people have a strong feeling about the project one way or another, we'd like to hear about it. I want you to call me. We know that the Water Board and DTSC already have --

You guys have already expressed your feelings about it, so you probably don't have to call me.

But anyhow, I may joke about it, but we plan to make a decision on how we want to proceed on this in the few weeks, so by the next time we meet we should know which path we're going on, and we'll tell you.

Petroleum Program. We had a Draft Plan prepared for us by GeoResource Consultants to address nine mini-cap sites. For those of you who are new here, a mini-cap site is a site where the Army went, and in most cases, they removed a tank, a petroleum tank; took it out of the ground, and they found that the tank had leaked, and they had to leave some petroleum in the soil below the tank. And they prepared what's called a mini-cap, which is kind of a form where they evaluate the risk posed by the site, what they know about how much was spilled or what the concentrations of petroleum are in the soil. What the Trust is doing -- We've inherited all these mini-cap sites, and so now we need to go through them and figure out what needs to be done. In some of these, we may conclude that If groundwater is very deep and the spill was minor, we may conclude that no additional action is necessary, and we would write a report recommending that and submit it to the Water Board who would then review it and either agree with us or say, "No, we don't agree. You better go back and fix it." I think the majority of mini-cap sites will probably require some

kind of additional work, either additional digging or soil treatment or something like that. So we're going through the process of looking at all these sites and figuring out what the problem is and deciding what's the reasonable thing to do about it.

We started that process with nine sites. Our consultant prepared a Draft Report for us that, in all honesty, we didn't like that much, so we send it back with a lot of comments, and they are revising it. And we hope to get a revised version within next month, so that we can then circulate it and people can look at it.

We're also working on a Draft Building Plan Overview, which is kind of a global look at the Petroleum Program. It's mostly in response to a question that Sam Berman has asked several times, which is could we provide a list of all the petroleum sites and what we propose to do about them. That has kind of gotten side-tracked as we've gotten busy with a few other things. But we're still working on it, and we hope to get it out for stakeholder review in late August.

MR. NELSON: Sir, if I could add something to that. One of the goals in contingency plan is to identify areas in the Presidio where known contamination exists, and differentiate from areas where, if the Trust is doing routine maintenance construction at all, etc, they may run across something that's unknown. And there will be a figure in that plan that shows

petroleum sites. So it may be redundant, but nevertheless, the goal is to get that map to talk to your map so that there are consistent. And so there will be two sources of that information. One may come out before the other one does.

MR. O'HARA: This is for George or Chris. Along the lines that you're talking about, what is the financial reality of going back and revisiting a mini-cap site where the Army allegedly took care of the problem, and you're having to revisit it; and based on the Water Quality Control Board or DTSC, how is that being addressed from a financial standpoint? Is this drawing on additional sums from the Army, or do you take the hit?

MR. FORD: It actually gets -- When the negotiation occurred between the Trust and the Army to get the hundred million dollars of remediation money, in that negotiation they assumed that most of the mini-cap sites would require some additional work, okay? They allowed money for that. So we do have to pay for it out of money we've already received, but we think that it's been adequately budgeted for.

MR. O'HARA: It wasn't anticipated at the time, and funds are available to take care of that?

MR. FORD: Yes.

MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

MR. FORD: All right. We're done with Petroleum. We can go on to Crissy Field closure.

We have a couple things left to do here. The skeet range cleanup is -- We're going through our internal contracting process. The estimated cost of the job is high enough that we need to go through a formal bidding process which we call an Invitation for Bids process. That takes a little longer than just requesting quotations. But we're pretty much through that process, and we expect to circulate the invitation for bids to contractors within the next two weeks. And I think this job will be one of the first ones that is posted on the Trust website so contractors can pull up the information from there. So we don't have a firm date on that, but we expect within the next couple of weeks we'll be sending out the bid package. It will take roughly a month to get the bids back.

MR. O'HARA: When would you anticipate that you would begin that work?

MR. FORD: That is a good question, and I'll tell you how I think we're going to look at it. The question will come up as to whether we want to try to do the work during the period of extremely low tides.

MR. O'HARA: Exactly. The lowest tides that we're going to see this summer are happening next week, and we're not going to make that deadline. The bids won't be ready. So I think what we will be doing -- The bid package is set up so that the contractor has to tell us what they plan to do about the water. Are they doing to try to do it at low tide? Are they going

to build cofferdams around the digging area, or put in cheap piling? Just how are they going to control the Bay water? And what I expect will happen is: If a contractor comes and says, "Gee. The price is \$125,000 if I can do it in August, and the price is \$37,000 if I can do it in December, when I believe the next extremely low tides occur."

At that point, I think we'd have a discussion with him about what time we're going to do it. It's one of these borderline cases where the amount of digging that has to be done is not huge, but some of it has to be done near the mean lower level waterline. That's pretty low. It's really right out, you know, the waves are crashing over that virtually all the time, and so they have to figure out a way to do the digging, to dig to a set dimension and a specified depth and document that they have completed that digging. You know, either find a way to do that while the waves are crashing, or if you can't do it with waves crashing, then you have to put up a barrier.

So I'm not quite sure how the contractors are going to bid it. We're going to leave it up to their option and see what they say. My hope is that we will be able to do the work in August through September, but if it is clear that we can save a ton of money by waiting until later in the year when we have some other extremely low tides, we would look at waiting.

MR. O'HARA: And it's currently planned to evacuate all of that material down the existing paths as opposed to along

the beach?

MR. FORD: Yeah. I think the job is too small to make a barge cost-effective. We're really only talking about 400 or 500 cubic yards. And so the bid package requires the contractor to dig the stuff off the beach, put it in trucks that are only partially loaded, and take the partially-loaded trucks down the Promenade and around to Mason Street where they can dump the soil. We'll provide a paved lot for them on Mason Street. They can stockpile the soil there, and then load it into big over-the-road trucks to take it away. So we want to minimize the hauling on the beach because there's some wildlife issues there. We think that using the Promenade as the haul route is the best idea, but we have to be careful that we don't run fully-loaded trucks all day on the Promenade because it's not meant for that kind of work.

MR. O'HARA: And it would be a PR disaster. Yes. Well, worse than that, I don't want to face Glenn Angel. The PR I could deal with, but if we wreck the Promenade, I don't want to be the guy who has to go tell Glenn. So we'll be very careful of the Promenade.

MR. BOGGS: As part of the skeet range, there was some sampling that was done earlier to determine the limits of where the excavations would be?

MR. FORD: Yes.

MR. BOGGS: Is that going to be put together in a

Results Report?

MR. FORD: In fact, Tredmo Rollas is working on that now, and so it should be -- I don't have a date for you, but that's -- It's coming out soon.

MR. BOGGS: And would that then, based on those results in cleanup levels, delineate your proposed limits of excavation?

MR. FORD: Yes. We've got to get that written up and get it to you before we -- That will happen shortly and well before the date.

MR. PONTON: And before the bid?

MR. FORD: I guess it has to happen before the bid. If we don't get it out before the bid, the bid package, in terms of outlining the areas, is very simple. So we can amend it if we have to. But we will try to get it to you before the bid package goes out. Now here is where I turn and look at Dorinda who is working on that.

MR. NELSON: Yeah. We have in the past been able to amend bids and extend the amount of time that the contractors have to respond, and our Labor Contracting Officer is here and can add the information if necessary. But if anything changes in relation to the bid and the limits of excavation, we can certainly get that out and extend the period of time in which they would have to respond. And therefore, if you have any concerns over how much is going to have to be excavated, that

can be added.

MR. PONTON: I would imagine it would affect the design.

MR. FORD: Well so far the design is just a little box drawn on the map. The bid package has a unit item for an additional excavation and additional backfill. So we do have the option of changing things around. But you're right, especially if we need to extend any of the excavation boundaries closer to the water, that becomes an important issue. But we'll get that drawn and get it out so that everybody can review it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, actually the results are showing that those areas are not changing that much. They're not increasing the sizes of the excavation very much. So I don't think the increase will be very big.

MR. FORD: Well, Dorinda and I will get our heads together and figure out when we can get that follow-up report into your hands. Okay.

Next one is Crissy Field Closure Sampling. The initial soil borings and the monitoring levels of the West Bluff area were installed over the last few weeks. We have some follow-up drilling that we need to do that is scheduled to begin July 27. We have one well that so far is dry, so we're going to need to deepen or redo that one. And we may have some other soil borings or monitoring wells that we need to add in to

make sure that we've met all the regulators' concerns. So that job is chugging along, but we still have a little more work to do in the field.

One thing that we'd like to propose, and it's this last bullet item here, is that in our discussion with the Water Board and DTSC last month, I think we sort of collectively decided a good way to handle the Fill Site 7 Closure Sampling issue. Fill Site 7 is a former Army fill site that is now the Crissy Field tidal marsh. It's basically the area that they dug out to build the marsh. What we would like to do is at the bimonthly meeting that is scheduled for next Tuesday, after we finish the office portion of the meeting, we'd like all the people who are attending to bring their hiking shoes, and we would like to walk around the perimeter of the marsh and spend about an hour doing that. And we can discuss where we need to sample and flag actual sampling points so that the sampling crew can then get out there a few days later. So if you're planning to attend the bimonthly meeting, please bring your hiking boots. I think that is it for the Crissy Field Closure Sampling.

The next one is my main topic for tonight, and it's discussing a project that we're spending a lot of time on right now. It's the development of a Remedial Action Plan for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. So here we go. And feel free to break in with questions. I'll try to define all the acronyms that we use, but if I do get going too fast and forget to do it, feel free to stop

me.

Here's the location map. And if you haven't seen Landfill 4, it's right there. It's next to the Central Magazine, which is up on top of Robb Hill. Fill Site 5 is a little circle over there, and it's on the west side of Washington Boulevard. To give you the other landmarks in the area, Baker Beach is down here, the World War II Memorial, the Sailors' Memorial is right about in that location. So it's up on top of the hill. It's kind of in the backyard of the Presidio. It's slightly off the beaten path. These are two landfills that were filled over the years by the Army. They are sites that we're focusing attention on right now. Next slide please.

This is a picture of Landfill 4. Most people have not seen Landfill 4. It is across Central Magazine Road from Central Magazine, and it consists of a small clearing that is completely surrounded by large mature Eucalyptus trees, and actually, in fact, has Eucalyptus trees growing up through the fill. So it really doesn't look like much. This is a nice picture, but that's what it looks like. It's just kind of a field with a lot of Eucalyptus trees growing. Next slide.

This is Fill Site 5, which those of you who have been up to the War Memorial or have or have driven along Washington Boulevard have probably seen it without knowing what you're looking at. It's a large vacant lot. We were just discussing how big it is. It's about three or four acres. It's a good-size dirt-

covered vacant lot that is just on the west side of Washington Boulevard. Next slide, please.

The goal of the project here -- The reason we're doing this Remedial Action Plan is that the Trust and the Park Service wanted to accelerate the cleanup of these sites. They seem to be relatively small and well-defined landfills, and we all agree that it would be a good thing if we could get some of these landfills cleaned up in 2001 rather than waiting until 2002 or later when the Base-wide Feasibility Study and the Remedial Action Plan were done.

We also wanted to collect information on the costs of excavating and either disposing or recycling some of these fill materials. And in the case of Fill Site 5, one of the things that we wanted to do was expand some endangered species' habitat. So we had a number of reasons why we're proposing to accelerate the cleanup of each site.

The job started out as a pilot Treatability Study. That's what we initially proposed to the regulatory agencies. And over time, as we heard their concerns and addressed them, the study evolved into an Interim Remedial Action Plan. And at this moment those of us who are working on the project daily are beginning to think -- We're sort of wondering why it's an Interim Remedial Action Plan. One of the thoughts that we are kind of kicking around is, "Isn't this really a Final Remedial Action Plan?" The intent here is that we're going to dig up these

landfills and remove them, and when we're done, we're going to be finished. We want to do it to the appropriate cleanup standards. We don't expect to have to come back and do additional digging later.

So one of the things that we want to discuss over the next few weeks and month or so is, does it make sense to change this to a Final RAP rather than an Interim RAP? And that is something that we'll be soliciting everybody's opinion on. We think there are advantages to changing it to a final RAP, so that once the RAP is approved, and we do the work that's in the RAP, we're finished; we're done; we don't have to come back. But people may have reasons or ideas why that would be the best idea. If you have an opinion on that, we would like to talk with you about it.

We have an initial draft of a Remedial Action Plan that we just received a few days ago, and the Trust and the Park Service are reviewing that, and after the revisions that we request are made, it will be circulated to the RAB and to the regulators so that everyone can review it.

MR. O'HARA: Is that initial draft an interim or a final?

MR. FORD: That's a hard question.

MR. ULLENSVANG: The cover says interim.

MR. FORD: The cover says interim but --

MR. ULLENSVANG: It reads like a final.

MR. FORD: Yeah, I guess that's it, and that's sort of the

thing that we're wrestling with, with the cover and all the documents leading up to it saying "Interim," but when you read the RAP, it's really final. And that's why we're thinking, "Gee, maybe it makes sense to drop this interim thing."

MR. BOGGS: If I could just clarify some of that from a regulatory standpoint. The reason we would call it an Interim RAP, regardless if the Trust wants to or not, is there's cleanup levels that are required to be approved by our agency that go through detailed reviews, part of the FS. Those won't be finalized by the time -- or at least when this was talked about, the timeline that this was proposed to be done. Similarly with ARARs, until those get finalized and agreed upon with the agencies -- our attorneys haven't even seen them yet -- we can approve things on an interim basis, such that if those ARARs change with the attorneys looking at them, we may have to go back next year and finalize a remedy. We pretty much are in agreement with the remedy being proposed is going to result in a final cleanup. There's not going to be any going back. There shouldn't be any problem. But administratively, we can't approve this as a final RAP without approving all those other elements. The schedule for those other elements, from my understanding up until now, is a much slower timeline than what's being proposed for Landfill 4/Fill Site 5.

MR. FORD: Bob brings up a good point. I think the only way this thing could become viable is if the -- Essentially if the

cleanup levels and the ARARs and the other components catch up to it, essentially. But if they go faster or this project goes slower -- but that's right. It can't be final until some of the important components of it are approved as being final.

I think there's a possibility that it could go that way. We might be able to get approval of the ARARs and the cleanup levels soon enough so that this could be final.

MR. O'HARA: Does it make a difference from a financial standpoint to slow the project down to wait until the administrative actions catch up to it, or to proceed with the plan and go back and have to make adjustments based on the administrative considerations that follow your activities?

MR. FORD: Well, that's a good question. The way we view it is that we would not push this to try to do it quickly if we thought there was much possibility at all that we would have to come back later and clean up some more, you know, to meet a new lower cleanup standard. The idea here would be to do it once. And so the only way we would go into it is if we either have an approved final cleanup level that we can dig to, so that we know once we meet that, we're really done. Or if we didn't have a cleanup level like that, I suppose we could make a judgment, you know, sort of try to make a prediction about what we think the final cleanup level would be, and clean up to that level. But if we get into a situation where we don't know what the final cleanup level is going to be, or if we think there is a lot

of risk that the number would change, I think at that point we would have to say it doesn't make sense to hurry this up. If there is any cost savings at all, they would be wiped out. If you have to come back the second time, that's going to wipe out any savings that you might accrue.

MR. BOGGS: And also, we anticipate that after this work is done and as the FS and Main Installation RAPS get finalized, this site would just fold over and become finalized basically in the final RAP. It would become memorialized with some signatures, and really nothing would change other than us all saying, "Yes, we've come to an agreement on the ARARs, cleanup levels, appropriate actions, et cetera." So really administratively there shouldn't be a significant cost by having it become final later.

MR. FORD: Okay. This is just some of the background. The Draft RAP -- We kind of touched on some of these points already. Some of the RAP builds on some of the work that came out of the Main Installation Feasibility Study, and then two specific things that are coming out of the Feasibility Study are cleanup levels which are being put together. They're in their own report. It will basically be a cleanup level report that comes out and lots of other documents will be key to that, and also the ARARs.

The RAP that we're putting together, the draft RAP, contains an evaluation of five remedial alternatives. Usually the

evaluation of remedial alternatives is done in a feasibility study, so it's completed before you get to the RAP. But in this case, because we're trying to compress the time, we've put the alternative evaluation in the RAP.

The five alternatives that are we're looking at are: No action; institutional controls, which in a nutshell would be we would put a fence around it and put a sign on the fence saying Don't Go In Here; capping or covering of the landfills; treatment of the soil to fix the contaminants so that they can't migrate, and the last one is dig it up and haul it away and recycle any masonry or anything else you can get out of it.

We expect that as we get through this analysis -- next slide please -- the preferred alternative is going to be excavation and off-site disposal of soil. I will be very surprised if we don't do that. And then some of the elements of the preferred alternative will be digging it up and disposing of it off-site. We will try to segregate and recycle any portions of the fill that are suitable for that. And that's most likely to be concrete or masonry. We don't there's a lot of household garbage in these fills, so we shouldn't be seeing a lot of metal cans and things like that.

The groundwater monitoring will be required. We'll be installing monitoring levels at both sites and monitoring them for a period of at least a few years. And at both sites, we expect to dig until we've exposed native soils, soils that existed at the

site before the Army started dumping fills. And we want to expose the native soils because that's what we need to do the site restoration. Next slide, please.

This shows one of the reasons that -- the real site -- the site that's really sort of juicy from a restoration standpoint is Fill Site 5. And you can see one the reasons here. This green field is basically where are heard to be serpentine soil areas, and the white areas are sand dune areas. And this circle, or this blob, is what we think are the limits of Fill Site 5. So you can see that the border between the dune native plant community and the serpentine native plant community originally we think trended right across this site, and it makes it an area where you can have exceptional biodiversity in plants and animals. So we can this is a particularly attractive site to restore as native habitat.

This is a photograph of Presidio clarkia blossom, which is a plant native to the Presidio and grows on serpentine soil. This is an example of some other plant that Terry's going to have to help me out with, because I don't know.

MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: San Francisco Alice Clover.

MR. FORD: Is it the Alice Clover? Okay. That's one that we picked because it looks very nice. It doesn't actually grow right in this area.

The site restoration that is going to be done after the cleanup will be done in accordance with the vegetation

management plan, which is now being worked on by the Trust.

Next slide, please.

This is the map of the vegetation management zoning for the Presidio. You can see that Fill Site or Landfill 4 is right there, and in that green area, that is historic forest. And so the intention is, after we take the fill off Landfill 4, it will be restored as historic forest.

Fill Site 5 is located right there, and it is in the native plant dune and serpentine areas, so the intention would be to restore that type of a plant community to Fill Site 5. Next slide please.

As far as historic forest, Fill Site 5 is a native plant community. The other thing to keep in mind is that after the cleanup is finished, and we remove the fill and expose the native soil, then the site's specific restoration plans will be written. It will come out in a RAP form and then RAB will have a chance to review. There will be a chance, probably early next year, to provide input on what type of restoration you'd like to see. Next slide.

There will be some other opportunities for public involvement in this process. We are trying to describe the program now in this meeting, and we'll be able to describe it in more detail in committee meetings.

The Draft RAP and the Work Plan that go with it will be circulated for review. We expect those to come out in August.

One of the things we'd like to do is have a site tour for the RAP. And I guess tonight I would like to get some -- if people have thoughts as to what is a good time to do that. Weekday, evening or late afternoon or weekend? If you can think about it and let us you know what you think might be best, we'll try to pick a date and time that works for most people.

MS. YAROS: Since it's staying light longer, couldn't we do an earlier RAB meeting since everyone already has that time kind of set aside?

MR. FORD: Yes. I think we can do that. Certainly if we're -- like an August RAB meeting, or one of the RAB committee meetings. If we wanted to start at 6:00 --

MS. YAROS: A half hour earlier, or an hour.

MR. FORD: Half an hour would be pretty tight, but I think an hour would be comfortable.

MR. O'HARA: George, what would be the objective of the site plan? What would we want to accomplish?

MR. FORD: I think most people haven't seen both of them. So it would just be an idea, you could see each site, get a feeling for how large they are and for the kind of changes we're going to have to make at each site, because at both of these sites we will have to remove some trees. So you'd be able to see how big the trees are, where they're located, and how much cover would still be left after we do the work; you know, just to try to get people familiar with the sites and what

we have to do here .

MR. O'HARA: I would suggest we meet at 6:00 in advance of the RAB meeting, spend an hour and come back down here. There would still be plenty of light.

MR. FORD: Yeah. There's enough light to do it right now. Certainly 6:00 o'clock would be okay. Staff? Is that what we should focus on? Let's plan on putting that on the agenda, and we'll send out a reminder. We'll pick a meeting spot, and we'll try to remind people a couple of times that this is one that you should come a little bit early to. The sites are just a couple of yards apart.

MR. NELSON: One of the sites has a nice parking lot. You can park at 5, and walk to 4.

MR. FORD: Okay. That's good. We'll plan on doing that.

MS. CHEEVER: A couple of us might not be here.

MR. FORD: The truth is we could do a couple of them. It's really no problem. I will be here for the next RAB meeting. We could do a couple of them, so that people, you know, can double your chances.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Why don't we plan for the July committee meeting, July 24?

MS. CHEEVER: We'd be meeting at 6:00 p.m., right here?

MR. NELSON: Fill Site 5 would probably be the best

place.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Jane will send an e-mail with instructions and confirm the time.

MR. FORD: We'll get there early and wave our hands. Okay.

Vegetation Restoration Action Plan. We already mentioned that. That will be likely coming out in the first quarter, sometime early next year. There's a thirty-day comment period for this Interim RAP. We expect that will be occurring in September, and there's also a required public meeting which we expect to be having, probably early in the first half of the public comment period, so it will be the first couple weeks of September. So when we get that schedule, we'll let everybody know what that is.

MR. O'HARA: What is the difference between the Vegetation Restoration Action Plan and the Vegetation Management Plan?

MR. FORD: Let me answer here, and Terry Thomas will jump in and fix it if I blow it. The Vegetation Management Plan is a Presidio-wide plan that discusses what's going to be done in what order, and over what timeframe.

This Vegetation Restoration Action Plan will be specific. There will be one for Landfill 4 and one for Landfill 5. It focuses on the specific sites.

MR. O'HARA: So it's really a subset of the Vegetation

Management Plan?

MR. FORD: Yeah. It's basically the plan that allowed me to implement the principles that are articulated in the Vegetation Management Plan.

Did I do okay, Terry? Thank you. This is a little bit outside my usual area.

I believe that's the schedule. We are shooting for a target date for beginning to remove Landfill 4 in October, in early October. Our intention is that the Trust will do that excavation using our own forces. We are gearing up to be ready to do that.

Fill Site 5 would go second. It will probably start in November, and that job will be done by a contractor. We've put together a bid package and sent it out.

The initial site preparation for both of these sites -- and I guess the sensitive habitat issues are most important in Fill Site 5. And Fill Site 5, we will be installing metal chain link fencing between the fill site work area and the adjacent sensitive habitat. There's a knoll out there now that has Clarkia and Raven's Manzanita. It's gotten too sensitive for an endangered species on it. One of the things we'll be doing first off is fencing it off to make sure that none of the construction activity leaks over into the existing sensitive habitat areas.

Then the second thing that will happen is removal of the

trees that are within the footprint of the existing landfills. The exact number of trees that have to be removed hasn't been settled yet, but it's around 30 trees in the Fill Site 5 area that have grown up through the edge of the fill, and the fill has been filed around. In Landfill 4, it's in the range of 50 to 60 Eucalyptus trees that either grow through the landfill or right around it. So they will have to be removed as part of the site preparation.

MR. NELSON: George, given that that's historic forest, and it's going to be replanted with historic forest, I assume that this plan, the Restoration Action Plan of Vegetation, will detail what sort of trees are going to be put back there?

MR. FORD: It's a good question. I think the plan is that they would be -- The historic forest in that area is Eucalyptus trees, and so most likely, they would be replaced with Eucalyptus trees. But as to whether it's the same variety of Eucalyptus -- I think there's some hope that they might be able to identify a less invasive variety of Eucalyptus that will be more manageable.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the Trust could do some studies on (INAUDIBLE) which can feed into the Vegetation Restoration Action Plan, (INAUDIBLE) to look at things such as forest diversity and other ways to (INAUDIBLE) have less of a mono culture within the historic forest.

MR. NELSON: Kind of similar to what they do on Park

Avenue there, Park Boulevard.

MR. ULLENSVANG: That's one of the ways look at the undergrowth (INAUDIBLE) historic forest.

MS. YAROS: When you say -- whoever said historic-- how old is historic? Because they're not native, I understand.

MR. NELSON: Eucalyptus are not, yeah, but some of the Eucalyptus trees that were planted by the Army in certain historic time periods contribute to the Historic Landmark District status of the Presidio. So it's kind of ironic --

MR. FORD: But they're not native, but they are historic.

MS. YAROS: That's why I'm asking, does anybody know when they were planted?

MR. NELSON: 1880s?

MR. O'HARA: There were a couple of different planting periods.

MR. FORD: Go ahead, Terry.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: The Jones Plan was written in the late 1800s. But most of the tree planting happened in the very, very early 1900s, like from 1895 through the earthquake era. And the actual map used is from 1935, so it's kind of like everything that was planted before 1935 is considered historic forest.

MR. O'HARA: What is the policy of the Trust in terms of recycling trees that you do take? Do you cut them up and chip them, or what do you do with them?

MR. FORD: Actually I think now the brush is chipped and the logs are recycled, but Peter Ehrlich, who is our forestry manager, would have to come in and give you the details for that. But I know when they do take down large trees, the logs are not chipped. They are either taken for fuel or lumber or something like that. I don't know the details. We can find out and let you know.

MR. O'HARA: I was sort of curious, having grown up in the area, I recall that, I believe a lot of the landfill bought is comprised of stumpage that has been -- especially after the big loads -- when there's a lot of trees that came down and hauled over to Landfill 5. And I was curious if we run into a lot of buried trees, if we'd cut them up and chip them or what you do with them?

MR. FORD: It's interesting that you would say that, because our view of Fill Site 5 right now is that it's kind of a central core of soil that is mostly soil. There's a halo around it that appears to be mostly woody debris -- stumps, logs, and brush that was just pushed off the edge. At this point we don't know how thick that is, or what condition it's in. But we will be looking if there is a way to recycle any of that or grind it up and reuse it. We will be looking at that.

MR. O'HARA: What we could do is truck the debris and trees and put them on one side of the road and accumulate them, and then transfer them to the other side of the road and

into the landfill.

MR. FORD: We think -- As far as we can tell, the Army was doing that possibly up into the early 90s when a lot of storm damage took place.

MR. KERN: I suggest it might be good for you to point out on the map to George what you were seeing. It might help.

MR. FORD: I was just going to say, I sure hope you can come on the site tour. That would be helpful. We are seeing a lot of wood debris on the slopes, where all the -- soil part of the landfill.

MR. NELSON: George, I can also address, in part, Peter's question in regards to what's going to happen to the trees. I don't know specifically what is going to happen to the trees at Landfill 4/Fill Site 5. It really depends on the size of the trees, the age, and wherever or not any of them can be dug up and reused.

At the Letterman site I was involved in a small portion of, I was walking with some contractors through an area of the parking lot adjacent to Lyon Street, where there were trees that were slated for reuse, and some that were slated for removal. And I came into contact with some contractors and firms that specialize in tree removal, and they basically take the root ball, and they encapsulate it, and they can store these trees in boxes. And they have an irrigation system they set up, and they keep them alive. And there's a plan for Letterman to reuse

some of the trees here. And these contractors can actually give the Trust a credit and take the trees also. So they may also have some connections on fuel, and whether or not the trees would be used for fuel, and things like that. I think it remains to be seen, but I'm sure Peter would be interested in looking into that issue, as opposed to wholesale slaughtering of 80 trees. If they can be reused for future fuel, it would be a good proposition.

MS. CHEEVER: It might be a good idea to make a presentation of our restoration efforts to some members of the community, especially during the public comment period, in late August or the beginning of September. So what I would like to propose is that we put on the agenda on our next meeting, July 24, to think about how we can do this, if you all are still willing to making some of those presentations, and how we can help you, how we can do it most efficiently.

MR. FORD: I think that would be a good thing to discuss. We do want to carry the message, so to speak.

MR. ULLENSVANG: It is helpful. Many of you represent or attend different groups around the area (INAUDIBLE) whole presentation. It's just being able to discuss it and a fellow member being here to answer questions. It's getting the word out, making sure the broader community is informed of what's going on, I think is good.

MS. CHEEVER: It would be helpful to me at our next

committee meeting is if we can somehow go over a brief summary of what we know, what contaminants are in the landfills. I'm sure that's something that would be the first question that they would ask me.

MR. FORD: Sure. We can put together a summary.

MR. NELSON: There's actually a lot of data collected in Landfill 4 last summer, if you recall in the Installation and Feasibility Studies. So we have a variety of slides, data, maps and tables showing where the contamination exists. That information can be disseminated again.

MS. CHEEVER: I thought these charts that you gave us, especially the one with the cross section, was very interesting and effective.

MR. NELSON: Yes.

MS. CHEEVER: Sometimes if you're just a citizen walking by there, it's hard to believe what's there.

MR. PATTON: Peter Ehrlich, our forester, wasn't available to be here tonight, nor will he be available for the August meeting, but I would encourage people to come to the Committee Meeting, because he will be available for that, and he can make a presentation. He'd be a good guy to go on the tour, and he can answer these questions that we're just giving you small answers to. So I would encourage people to turn out, if they have interest in it, to the Committee Meeting.

MS. YAROS: I would like to hear the other side of not

replacing Eucalyptus with Eucalyptus trees, maybe with something better. Again, I mentioned it last time, and I don't need to take time up. I like Eucalyptus trees, but there are problems with them. They are not native. They do have a very shallow root system, and they topple. And I wonder if Peter or someone could give us another point of view to replace them with something else equally wonderful or better?

MR. PATTON: I think that's an excellent idea. I don't believe we have experts here to discuss that, but we will at the Committee Meeting.

MS. YAROS: This man will do that?

MR. PATTON: It probably won't be just Peter alone. Peter can handle a portion of it. We'll probably have another member of the Trust talk about the Vegetation Management Plan, what's going to do back in there.

MS. YAROS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FORD: I think that's the end of what I have to say about Landfill 4/Fill Site 5. I'll open it to questions.

MR. KERN: Will your RAP, Interim RAP, discuss how the site would be left after excavation and until such time as the full restoration --

MR. FORD: Yeah. That's a component of the RAP, because there will be -- We're going to have to do some temporary stabilization. When we dig in October and November -- When we finish digging by the end of the year,

you know, the Vegetation Restoration Plan, and in fact, the plants that have to be put there, will not be ready right then. So we will have to button up both of the sites for a portion of next year, and that will be described in the RAP, how we're going to do that.

MR. KERN: Any other questions on any of these presentations?

MR. BOGGS: Just for the Landfill 4/Fill Site 5, is there any time when a draft would be together that I could get a copy -- not as a review copy, but I need it to complete the CEQA documentation.

MR. FORD: Yeah. I think that's the short answer. We could get you something shortly.

MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the thing to do is have discussions with you, (INAUDIBLE) trying to get something to you we're (INAUDIBLE) looking at in the Interim Review is we don't want to give you something that we think is missing.

MR. FORD: I think where we're headed is we can probably get you an annotated copy. You know, here's what we've got, a list of what we think has to be added.

MR. BOGGS: That would be fine.

MR. FORD: We'll put our heads together, Brian and I and Dorinda and figure out when we can get that to you, and then we'll call you and let you know.

MR. KERN: That's the end of the reports and

discussions. Bob and Jim, Regulatory Status Updates.

MR. BOGGS: I don't have a lot to update other than what's been said. We have been basically completing a draft of the CEQA documentation for Landfill 4/Fill Site 5. Basically that will be out for public review at the same time as the Interim RAP, and hopefully everything will go smoothly.

MR. KERN: Item 9. New business. We are working on a Landfill E report. It's something I want to begin to get out, an executive summary to people rather soon, for the review. In this time period, it's a little slow for us in the summer, so it's something that I think we really need to get a lot of consensus around so we can start circulating that soon.

Any other new business items?

Action items. We're going to have this next Tuesday bimonthly meeting. You're asked to bring hiking boots if you're coming for that. There's going to be a site tour at the next RAP meeting. We're going to have Peter Ehrlich and some other folks come at the next meeting to talk about vegetation issues. Those are some of the actions items that I have. Any other ones?

MS. CHEEVER: If Peter Ehrlich had time, he could come to part of the site tour.

MR. NELSON: I think there is a good possibility for doing that on the 24th committee meeting. I don't think we will be able to do that for the RAP meeting.

MS. MONAGHAN: The membership committee will be starting to gather some information about that and getting back to you.

MR. KERN: For the new applicants, we should go over generally what the process and the timelines are so we can give them expectations.

MS. MONAGHAN: Probably in the next month or two we'll be citing recommendations. I think September would be a good time.

MR. YOUNGKIN: The July 12th Groundwater Meeting is Thursday at 2:00 p.m.

MR. KERN: We've been talking about agenda items for the next RAB meeting. Those are going to be -- I think we're trying to focus on Fill Site 5 issues for sure. Other agenda items? Are there any other items to discuss tonight?

MR. O'HARA: Along what you just said, I would request as a practical matter that we set aside most of the agenda for the August meeting to go over the site visit and for discussion of those issues; spend an hour up there and come back down and have a discussion. And probably as a practical matter, it should last for an hour and a half to two hours, which pretty much eats up the time that would be the agenda.

MR. KERN: I think that's a reasonable idea, and if there are a couple of other items that come up, we'll try to cover them. But that may also help the project, to get out whatever

input people have from the site, when they're fresh to discuss it.

MR. O'HARA: It as though Trust for whatever reason wants to fast-track these two sites. We need more discussion up front from our perspective.

MR. KERN: Any other announcements or discussion? I would just like to say thanks to those of you who are here tonight to potentially apply. We certainly will stay around after the meeting. If you have any questions, please come up and talk to us about it. Thanks for also staying with this. We usually have a break, but we didn't have a break time tonight, but we'll get out a little bit earlier than normal. So thanks for your patience. Thank you to our reporter for laboring for the blistering two hours.

Without further ado then, the meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.)

ATTENDANCE

RAB MEMBERS

Bob Boggs, EKI

Julie Cheever

George Ford, Presidio Trust

Doug Kern

Jan Monaghan

Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

Peter O'Hara

Jane Packer, Presidio Trust

Jim Patton

Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board

Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

Tracy Wright

Gloria Yaros

Mark Youngkin

-

---o0o---

1

45

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

COPY

August 14, 2001

7:10 p.m

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Page 3

1 and one has recently come out, so that those of us who
2 have helped in the past should get our act together for
3 another installment to the cleanup newsletter.

4 We spent quite a bit of time on membership, looking into
5 distribution of applications and distributed assignments
6 to get those done.

7 What else? Landfill 4 and 5, which we will be talking
8 about again tonight. There was an update on Fill Site 7.
9 Several of us had visited Fill Site 7, which is Crissy
10 Field, to look at sites where we might do a final
11 confirmation sampling to ensure that that site is clean,
12 basically a closure sampling.

13 We had a report by Tom Kingston of the Presidio Trust on
14 the Remediation Program, financial information. It was
15 quite informative.

16 We had a presentation by Jane regarding some plans for
17 the website.

18 That looks like it will be a good resource for everyone.
19 That is about the scope. Anything else?

20 So we usually have our RAB Committee meetings on the
21 fourth Tuesday of the month, meeting in building 1750
22 which is at the west end of the Presidio near the dune
23 restoration and near the Water Treatment Plant and that
24 area of the Presidio.

25 Moving on then. Are there any other committee reports or

Page 2

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

August 14, 2001

7:10 p.m.

---oOo---

6 MR. KERN: Good evening. I'd like to welcome everyone
7 here tonight, members of the Presidio Trust and their
8 contractors, several members of the Park Service, National
9 Park Service, are here; our regulatory community;
10 community RAB members, and potential members of the RAB.
11 They're several here tonight. Welcome to the meeting, and
12 particularly any members of the general public here, thank
13 you for coming out tonight to hear more about cleanup
14 issues at the Presidio.

15 Does everyone have an agenda? Are there any changes or
16 additions at this time to the agenda? No? We move ahead.

17 Any announcements or old business? All right.

18 Committee reports. Julie, our RAB Vice Co-Chair -- there
19 is a rather specific name that she has, Alternate Co-Chair
20 -- did a terrific job at our last committee meeting. She
21 is not here tonight, so I'll just run down quickly some of
22 the things that we covered, and perhaps those of you who
23 were there can help me fill in.

24 We did look, at the beginning of the meeting, some issues
25 with the new newsletter for the Environmental Department,

Page 4

1 announcements? By the way, just an editorial comment, we
2 usually have quite a few more community members here, but
3 this is the traditional slow month, so we really do
4 welcome all of you. Let's move on to Item No. No. 5,
5 Chris Nelson of the Presidio Trust.

6 MR. NELSON: Thanks Doug. My name is Chris Nelson. I'm a
7 Project Manager with the Presidio Trust, and I'm here to
8 talk about some of projects that the Environmental
9 Remediation Department has been working on, along with
10 some assistance from Jennifer Coats to my right.

11 If you follow along on the handout, it's like this
12 (indicating). It goes from left to right. It's slides.

13 The first thing I'm going to talk about is the
14 Presidio-wide contingency plan. We have received a
15 draft of the plug-in Remedial Action Work Plan, which
16 includes as an Appendix the Contingency Plan, which is the
17 former incarnation of this document, I guess you could
18 call it. We received it from our consultant Earl
19 Cowanowski last month, and we're currently reviewing the
20 document along with the National Park Service. At this
21 time, we're trying to strategize the best time to release
22 it based on some of the other documents that are going to
23 be coming out. We will have a logjam of documents for
24 review for the agencies. There are some very big and
25 important documents coming up, which we'll get into in a

Page 5

1 little bit. So I would anticipate seeing that within the
2 next thirty days or so.

3 On the Main Installation Feasibility study, there are two
4 field investigations that are scheduled. One of them is a
5 carbon tetrachloride soil gas investigation in the
6 vicinity of Battery Howe Wagner at Fort Scott. We
7 received an approval from the regulatory agencies on that
8 Fill Sampling Plan in the last week or so, and we
9 anticipate getting out in the field within the next few
10 weeks. At this time, the work is being reviewed through
11 the internal EE/CA and historical clients permitting
12 processes. And once that paperwork is approved, we will
13 move forward.

14 We also have some additional sites where we're doing some
15 data gathering, primarily soil sampling. These sites
16 include Buildings 1244 and 1245, 1351 at Fort Scott,
17 Building 215 in the Main Post and Building 1750 in the
18 Lomas Creek Valley. We hope to get an internal review of
19 the field sampling plan in the next few weeks from Earl
20 Cowanowski. And once we get a review of that, we'll
21 discuss it and turn that around. That's a fairly high
22 priority item for review by the RAB and the agencies. Our
23 intention at this time it is to include the data from
24 these sites in the Feasibility Study and the Main
25 Installation and include these sites in the RAP so that we

Page 7

1 was

2 screening chemicals of concern. And this document was
3 also released last week to the RAB and the agencies. So
4 we're looking for a fairly fast review on that as well,
5 Somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty days, I believe.
6 Are there any questions on the Feasibility Study?

7 MR. BERMAN: I have a question on the ARARs. Has the DTSC
8 seen them?

9 MR. NELSON: Yes.

10 MR. BERMAN: This is the first time they're seen them?

11 MR. NELSON: Yes.

12 MR. BERMAN: There has been no preliminary discussion
13 with them at all?

14 MR. NELSON: Not really, no. We did receive some input
15 from the Regional Water Quality Control Board last year on
16 considering ARARs for Bay Area sites. In particular, when
17 we took that into account, we went through a fairly
18 thorough and exhaustive effort evaluating the ARARs. So
19 I'd challenge anyone to add to them. It may happen, but
20 we feel like we've left no stone unturned.

21 The Trust is also working with the other stakeholders on
22 a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study for five
23 small-arms firing ranges that were operated by the Army
24 here at the Presidio. The current deliverable that's
25 underway is the Work Plan that was prepared by our

Page 6

1 can include as many sites as possible, and not have any
2 data gaps. That's what we're looking forward to in the
3 RAP.

4 On the Feasibility Study Report, we're currently
5 reviewing a document and providing comments to our
6 consultant for incorporation into the report. We
7 anticipate that document should be out within the next
8 month or so, unless there are some changes to the
9 priorities.

10 ARARs -- for those of you who don't know what that means
11 -- this is a list of laws and regulations that all
12 remedies under the CERCLA Superfund cleanup have to comply
13 with. And ARARs stands for applicable or relevant
14 appropriate requirements. we release these ARARs, which
15 is actually a section of the Feasibility Study Report,
16 Chapter 7 I believe, to the RAB and the agencies last
17 week. And so we're looking for input from agencies on
18 that issue. It's important to get some of these issues
19 resolved early because we do have the Landfill 4/Fill Site
20 5 Interim RAP coming
21 out, and these ARARs have to be finalized for that RAP to
22 go forward.

23 Presidio-wide cleanup document for soils, surface water
24 and groundwater was developed, and we worked many months
25 with the agencies and the RAB developing these numbers and

Page 8

1 consultant Treadmill & Rolan.

2 The Trust and Park Service have been reviewing that work
3 plan. The Work Plan is essentially a strategy document
4 that also outlines the Sampling Plan for gathering data at
5 five sites and filling data gaps that were left behind
6 with the Army Site Investigation. We anticipate being
7 able to present this RFS strategy in a future RAB meeting,
8 perhaps next month if the document is ready for
9 discussion.

10 One last item that I have to discuss is the Public Health
11 Service Hospital landfills, Landfills 8 and 10. We've
12 been working closely with the Park Service to decide on
13 the best course of action for these sites, and we've come
14 to an agreement on moving forward on additional
15 characterization on Landfills 8 and 10. We received some
16 direction from the DTSC to conduct final reviews for the
17 remedies.

18 For those of you that do not know, the site was -- the
19 remedies were chosen by the Army with DTSC's concurrence
20 in 1995. And so what we're doing now is evaluating, after
21 five years, the effectiveness of the remedies. Part of
22 that will be to do some initial characterization of the
23 sites. We're moving forward with discussing the scope of
24 work with the consultant and getting some comments
25 incorporated into the Work Plan that we can release for

Page 9

1 review. And we hope to get the field work done late this
2 year.

3 Once we've completed the field work and evaluated the
4 data, we can evaluate our options as to what would be good
5 sites

6 and what the Park Service says about the remedies and how
7 they're working.

8 MR. BERMAN: We did see some true remediation work done
9 in terms of plantings and other efforts that were going to
10 made. Did we have a presentation on that about a month
11 ago?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Are you talking about Grade Area 9?

13 MR. BERMAN: Oh, okay.

14 MR. NELSON: It's across the street from the landfill.

15 MR. BERMAN: Yes. But it's not going to go -- that work
16 will not go over into that landfill?

17 MR. NELSON: Does that answer your question?

18 MR. BERMAN: Yes. I remember seeing work coming up
19 against Landfill 8, and I just needed a clarification --

20 MR. NELSON: Are you talking about last summer when we
21 did the trenching, or was it something more recent?

22 MR. BERMAN: The vegetation.

23 Mr. NELSON: Yes, at this time, Grade Area 9 is in the
24 Main Installation, so -- I know there were some sites that
25 were bounced back and forth. The ones that were in the

Page 11

1 1065 Update. That's George's project. I'd just like to
2 say that we're going to perform additional
3 characterization before there's any CAP update. So it
4 will be a field program, and that will be released this
5 Fall, the plan, for stakeholder review.

6 Petroleum Program. The Mini-CAPS or the Mini-Corrective
7 Action Plans that were developed for the petroleum sites,
8 primarily it's quick, easy remedies to close the sites.

9 We have a contractor working for us to summarize the data.

10 We received one round, and we wanted to tighten it up a
11 little bit. They are incorporating our comments. Once
12 they are incorporated, it will be sent for review. George
13 is preparing a draft, an overview that lists the sites and
14 the anticipated work schedule. And that will be out late
15 this summer.

16 MR. BERMAN: In terms of the cost of that, have you run
17 into any unexpected cost at all in the preliminary
18 examination of what the various steps are?

19 MS. COATS: We haven't researched that. Primarily we're
20 looking at the data gaps on what would have to be done,
21 either soil sampling or groundwater characterization. So
22 we haven't physically started any work.

23 MR. BERMAN: But nothing unusual has shown up?

24 MS. COATS: Not yet.

25 Crissy Field Closure Activities for the Skeet Range

Page 10

1 Main Installation that went into the Public Health are now
2 back in the Main Installation, so those should be in the
3 Feasibility Study.

4 If there are no more questions for me, I'm going to hand
5 the floor over to Miss Coats.

6 MS. COATS: Thanks Chris. My name is Jennifer Coats with
7 the Trust Remediation Department. I was going to run
8 through a couple of items here, some of the projects I am
9 working on, and some are projects that Mr. Ford is working
10 on. He is on vacation, so I will cover for him.

11 The Groundwater Monitoring Program. We have received the
12 first, the internal draft of our first sampling round, and
13 we're doing an internal review. I'd like to point out
14 that the first report that we're preparing includes
15 historical data, so as you review the document, you can
16 compare trends at the site, or look at the data. And it's
17 going to come as a document. It's about 10 inches thick.
18 I look forward to that in a few weeks. And we're planning
19 our next round of sampling to begin the 27th. That's
20 about it.

21 Mountain Lake Project. The report was released last
22 month, July 10. There's a copy in our library. Right now
23 basically we're just working to determine the allocation
24 of financial responsibility. So there is no new
25 developments to report tonight.

Page 12

1 Project. Additional samples were collected to define the
2 boundary, and a letter report is forthcoming later this
3 month. The Crissy Field Closure Sampling: The marsh
4 closure samples were collected on July 20th, and right now
5 the Trust is waiting for results to come in from that
6 sampling effort. So there's no data to report tonight.
7 So I think that's about it for the projects. Does anybody
8 have any questions?

9 MR. BERMAN: On the groundwater sampling, who was the
10 contractor?

11 MS. COATS: Treadmill and Rolan was the engineering
12 contractor, and the physical sample was performed by Lane
13 Technical Services.

14 MR. BERMAN: So the report was prepared by --

15 MS. COATS: Treadmill and Rolan.

16 MR. BERMAN: Have you looked at it at all?

17 MS. COATS: Yeah. I received it yesterday morning, I've
18 looked at it a little bit. It's a lot of data. It's
19 quite extensive.

20 MR. BERMAN: So you don't have any preliminary response
21 other than --

22 MS. COATS: I'm very pleased right now. Very pleased.

23 MR. PONTON: When do you think we'll get it?

24 MS. COATS: As soon as possible. It's very thick.

25 MR. PONTON: It says here it goes to -- it's an internal

Page 13

1 review, right?

2 MS. COATS: I don't want to commit to too early a date,
3 without having gone through the data.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: And as you can imagine, the first time
5 you review new data -- take the formats. There will be
6 some that will need to be straightened out so there's less
7 opportunity for misinterpretation, database errors. So I
8 would guess it would be several weeks.

9 MR. PONTON: Just a detailed question. (INAUDIBLE) kept
10 a certain number of quarters in their latest document for
11 a particular site. Do you know if you're going to keep
12 all the data for a site in this review?

13 MS. COATS: From this particular report, it's everything;
14 everything that we have is being included. We will pare
15 it down for future reports, since this is the transition
16 report.

17 MR. NELSON: Are you done then?

18 MS. COATS: All done.

19 MR. NELSON: Thank you. Next we have a discussion of the
20 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 Remedial Action Plan presented
21 by Brian Ullensvang of the Park Service.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: While George is on vacation, I'm going
23 to try to recap a lot of what he went over last month and
24 refresh everyone and give a few highlights of the work
25 that's going on now, and update everyone on where the

Page 14

1 schedules are moving toward the Interim RAP.

2 For those who of you like a map, I think almost everyone
3 here has been to one of the two, if not both of the sites.
4 Fill Site 5 is right out here; Landfill 4 is right in that
5 area.

6 The goal of moving these two sites into the Interim RAP
7 is to accelerate the cleanup of these sites, collect
8 useful information, (We talked a lot about that during the
9 tours), and to expand the endangered species habitat.
10 That is particularly true of Fill Site 5.

11 The Draft Interim RAP will build on work that has been
12 done on the Main Installation. So the cleanup levels will
13 be those in the cleanup level document that will come out.
14 The ARARs for the RAP will be essentially the same as
15 those (INAUDIBLE). So you'll see a lot of parallels as we
16 go there.

17 Since the Feasibility Study is not out, this Interim RAP
18 will include the evaluation of alternatives. That's a
19 little bit nonstandard. It's similar to what we've done
20 at Crissy Field, and it is a way to expedite (INAUDIBLE).

21 So for this RAP, there will be four alternatives looked
22 at: No Action; Institutional Controls for Groundwater
23 Monitoring; Capping with Institutional Controls and
24 Groundwater Monitoring, and Excavation, Recycling and
25 Off-Site disposal. If you haven't guessed, that will be

Page 15

1 the preferred alternative.

2 The general elements of the preferred alternative will be
3 the Excavation and Off-Site Disposal Fill. The
4 segregation and recycling materials in the Fill, we talked
5 a little bit about that on the tours, and that is when
6 possible. At this point, we really don't know to what
7 extent that will be possible, feasible or economic.
8 That's one of the objectives of this work is going to try
9 to explore that for future excavation. Groundwater
10 monitoring is required for a minimum of three years
11 following what they call clean closure of a landfill. And
12 so that will be part of the elements of the remedy.

13 One of the objectives is to actually expose the native
14 soil. Following the removal of material, the fill
15 material, the site restoration will be done in accordance
16 with the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP). For Landfill 4
17 that is restoration of historic forest; For Fill Site 5,
18 that is native plant communities. For each of the sites,
19 there are water studies that are underway to help to find
20 specific elements that those two general templates will
21 employ. And as was mentioned last month, those specific
22 Revegetation and Restoration Plans will be provided to the
23 RAB for opportunity for review. We can do a presentation
24 to help work through what those elements are. Hopefully,
25 many of you have had an opportunity to talk to some of the

Page 16

1 resource folks that were on the tours.

2 Within the Rap, there will be several opportunities for
3 public involvement. There have been site tours and
4 committee meetings' discussion. Hopefully that's helpful
5 to many of you.

6 The Draft RAP, and the actual Work Plan that's in the
7 Draft, will be available hopefully by the end of this
8 month or definitely by the beginning of September at the
9 RAB meeting for initial review. Following that review,
10 there is a formal official 30-day public comment period.
11 That is expected to occur in October. Hopefully, main
12 concerns that have been identified from the RAB and the
13 Agency has been incorporated, so that document is fairly
14 clean for the review process.

15 In the middle of that review process, there will be a
16 public meeting, where we will have the opportunity to
17 provide former comments. And as I mentioned earlier, the
18 Vegetation Plans will be circulated to the RAB for review.

19 For the timing of the work, there is a number of things
20 that have to come together. Generally what the Trust is
21 currently looking at is that before we excavate and
22 following the completion of the RAP, Fill Site 5 will be
23 done by contractor crews, and can anticipate a lot of
24 their work (INAUDIBLE).

25 Now some of the things that are going on currently, or in

Page 17

1 the near term, there are plant surveys in process. This
2 is cataloging the size and nature of the trees that
3 inhabit the Fill Sites. There is an ongoing review and
4 gathering of historic aerial photography to try to get as
5 much as we can about the understanding of what was at
6 these sites during and prior to their filling operations.

7 As we've mentioned last month, some of the initial
8 activities that you'll be able to see at this site would
9 be the fencing of the work areas that are supposed to
10 protect visitors and to protect sensitive habitat from the
11 work elements, and then the removal of the trees within
12 the accepted footprints of the landfill will happen early
13 in the process.

14 This isn't going to project very well, and I apologize
15 for that, but this will give you an idea of the types of
16 activities that are ongoing. This is a map of Landfill 4.
17 As you can see, each of the dots represent a cataloged
18 tree at or near the site. The size of the dot is somewhat
19 indicative of the size of the tree. The bigger the dot,
20 the bigger the tree. An actual inventory is being made
21 measuring each tree, cataloging by number of species, so
22 that can be reported. What will happen is generally within
23 the expected area of excavation, which is the left side or
24 the western side of the sector, the tree within the or
25 immediate adjacent to the work area will be removed. And

Page 19

1 photograph, given the fact that there has been a lot of
2 growth in that area subsequent, do you still find those
3 kind of conditions on either side of that dividing line?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. We find the soil types on each side
5 of the line. So over in this area we may find a sandy
6 matrix in the soil, and on this side we do see the
7 serpentine, the rocks and soil. This area right through
8 here appears and has been mapped as a potential fault. We
9 do see at this point there is a seep, right here, and if
10 you recall from the work that was done by the Trust last
11 summer at this site there are two wells that were placed,
12 one right there and one right over there, straddling this
13 visual difference which is still somewhat visible but not
14 to the degree that we see here. And at this point, this
15 whole area -- and Sharon, if you could back up one more --
16 I apologize, the map has rotated here, but that line is
17 roughly here. So you can see the forest has grown on both
18 sides that it somewhat obliterates the habitats that were
19 in there.

20 MR. BERMAN: So if you look at the '36 photo and look at
21 it now, is there a reason to think that there has been
22 seismic activity?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. Just because there is a fault
24 doesn't mean that it's necessarily been an active fault.
25 I have not heard anyone suggest that is somehow an active

Page 18

1 the inventory is broad enough, and the landfill is bigger
2 than expected.

3 Here's Fill Site 5. It's a little bit better background
4 to it. We had them photographed before, but it didn't
5 show up very well, so we didn't use that. You can see the
6 types of trees. For Fill Site 5, it's 50 to 70 trees that
7 are expected to go as part of the reconstruction area.

8 I got two different aerial photographs. They're not
9 going to show up nearly as well as they do in real life,
10 but they're quite fascinating, the types of things that
11 can be seen here. In 1936, even at that point you can
12 begin to see the grading operations occur at the area of
13 Fill Site 5. One of the things that the resource
14 folks just get extremely
15 excited about is, you can see some of the habitat that was
16 there prior to the activities. You can see a dunes scrub
17 over in this area with more of a serpentine grass line
18 over here. You can see a very clear, defined line between
19 those two habitats. This is one the features that makes
20 this site a very valuable site from a restoration point of
21 view, in that this area borderlines some serpentine
22 grasslands, and it also provides a transition between two
23 types of habitat, which tends to have a broader diversity
24 than just one single type.

25 MR. O'HARA: Excuse me. Before you leave that

Page 20

1 fault. It's a geological feature.

2 Here's 1955. The Trust had not yet got a stereo
3 (INAUDIBLE) for these photographs which would help be able
4 to look at things from a photography chain might have
5 happened. But this building has appeared. When you're
6 walking around the site, you could see the foundation work
7 that's out there. You can also see out here on the top of
8 that kind of rise to the north where there's sensitive
9 species. There is a building out there. Jim pointed out
10 that that area was not an (INAUDIBLE). You could see that
11 this has some work that has been done, maybe a road or
12 access. If you were to go back to 1936, you could see
13 that the road comes in here more from the south. By 1955,
14 it's now come out from over this way. So that will kind
15 of help us if we get down to the digging to see where we
16 might be out of the fill and do a modified native and
17 things like that.

18 You can also see that the habitat has less distinction.
19 Something curious had happened over here to remove some of
20 the brush, but it's all speculative of what happened. So
21 this is the type of thing that's going on now as far as
22 the detailed planning. We have a lot of other feeding
23 into the restoration elements following the remediation,
24 but it's all part of making sure the project gets to
25 completion.

Page 21

1 MR. BERMAN: Looking at the shape of the fault in the '55
2 photo and the present one, it just looks visibly
3 different. Not so much between the '36 and the '55, but
4 the recent one. It seems to have a somewhat different
5 shape. Of course, the vegetation obscures it a little
6 bit, so it may be hard to --

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: We think that in this area here there
8 needs to be a refill. There has been other earthquakes.
9 You may not notice, but it is going on.

10 If you could back up to '36. You could see here is a
11 quarry, and this is the current World War II Memorial, and
12 it's obviously changed now, but that's what created that
13 over the years. So it's very interesting. There is also
14 some sort of trace out through here, some sort of
15 activity. In the actual photograph there's something
16 going on here, something stored in the ground. It hasn't
17 been really dissected as to what it is. And it may not be
18 very important, but as work is going on, having these
19 photographs and knowing what they may or may not be able
20 to tell may help to understand what's being done.

21 MR. BERMAN: Is there any log on what that building was
22 used for, the one that's on the left side of the fill, the
23 larger one?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not aware of it, but I'm not versed
25 in all the buildings' histories.

Page 23

1 disposed of at that site. So it confirms work that's going
2 on so far.

3 It will be interesting to see during the excavation what
4 condition the wood is in. You were talking about a tour,
5 a tour of recycling, if available, that (INAUDIBLE)
6 doesn't have any either cheaper disposal options because
7 it has value, or does it actually have a value? So that
8 kind of gives you an update on where Fill Site 5 and
9 Landfill 4 RAB is and how it's coming along.

10 MR. BERMAN: When you look at Landfill 4, there's so many
11 trees there. And some of them look fairly old. It's a
12 puzzle to figure out how it was used as a landfill,
13 presuming the trees were there before.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: These photographs --

15 MR. NELSON: We have super ones from before, but they're
16 not very exiting to look at, so we didn't put them up on
17 the screen tonight, because they just show trees.

18 MR. BERMAN: How do they actually -- What do they do? Do
19 they take wheelbarrows and dump the stuff in between the
20 trees? It doesn't look like there's much room for any
21 type of vehicle.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know.

23 MR. NELSON: Also, if you consider the volume of Fill 4,
24 which is expected to be less than 6,000 cubic yards, it's
25 hard to believe that it was used for the period of time

Page 22

1 MR. NELSON: It hasn't come up. In a lot of obvious
2 places where you do a lot of sites and reinstallation,
3 you'll see what the buildings were used for, and there's
4 ways to find out, but these two have been rather
5 mysterious as to what they were used for.

6 MR. BERMAN: Chemical warfare.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Let's hope not.

8 MS. COATS: The buildings are still there.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. This building here is gone. There is
10 a piece of sidewalk left. This building here is nothing
11 more than a concrete foundation. The structures are gone.
12 Again, maybe there are in the fill.

13 MR. BERMAN: So there is a possibility that the larger
14 building is just pushed over into the --.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: We can all speculate at this point. No
16 one knows.

17 MR. NELSON: It's not like there is surface debris
18 that shows that. Primarily what you see is wooded debris,
19 like tree stumps and vegetation. But it could be
20 underneath.

21 MR. BOGGS: There's some big concrete blocks embedded if
22 you climb up in there.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: We might find some interesting things
24 during excavation. Peter pointed out from his experience
25 out here in the past, he's familiar, and a lot of wood was

Page 24

1 that it was, without defending just perhaps what you were
2 saying. It's sort of how it's being used today. You see
3 ashes out there and tree stumps. Many things over time
4 were just dumped out there, and it just accumulated. So
5 quite possibly things were dumped out between the trees
6 and left there.

7 MR. BERMAN: When the COCs were looked at for
8 Landfill 4, were there any heavy metals in there?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: I know that lead is a contaminant of
10 concern.

11 MS. COATS: For Landfill 4, it's cadmium, copper, lead,
12 and zinc.

13 MR. BERMAN: So is there any possibility they were
14 dumping stock from the munitions storage building right
15 nearby?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: There weren't any evidence of munitions
17 in the trenching operations, so I don't know. Metals can
18 come from a number of things.

19 MR. BERMAN: But the idea of the munitions storage being
20 right on the periphery there, and the dump being slightly
21 downhill, it would be easy for a wheelbarrow to move from
22 the munitions storage to the area itself. So it's kind of
23 surprising.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it will be very fascinating to
25 see what's actually in the fill. We want to get some

Page 25

1 on-site experience with these landfills. Landfills have
2 been moved other places. We'll learn a lot.

3 MR. NELSON: We have a fairly large catalogue of
4 photographs that were taken at trenching activities last
5 year by two Trust consultants, and the Trust employees
6 were out there, so (INAUDIBLE) at the public meeting
7 people will get an idea of what it looks like when they're
8 digging.

9 Are there any other questions of Brian or anyone else
10 from the Trust on recent activities?

11 MR. BERMAN: Will we get a report from, after you
12 reviewed the groundwater sampling, of what you think of
13 Treadmill & Rolan's analysis?

14 MR. NELSON: An evaluation per say, or -- I think there
15 will be a section of the report, correct me if I'm wrong,
16 that evaluates the data currently versus historically, and
17 says something about where things are going. But it's
18 difficult to say, since this is the first quarter in a
19 long time that log sites have been monitored. So I don't
20 think that there will be any separate, independent report
21 evaluating Treadmill & Rolan's performance.

22 MR. BERMAN: But it's certainly interesting to see what
23 trends are happening. You're the professionals that are
24 going to go through that and examine those trends. It
25 will be interesting to hear some information out of that.

Page 27

1 science.

2 MS. COATS: But we'll try to highlight any known
3 differences, such as sampling.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: And we can certainly discuss that at a
5 committee meeting or something like that, if something is
6 of interest.

7 MR. KERN: Okay. Let's move on to Item No. 6, Regulatory
8 Agency Status Updates.

9 MR. BOGGS: I don't really have anything to add. Getting
10 set up to review a lot of reports.

11 MR. PONTON: I guess along those lines, if I have it
12 straight, we have the Presidio-wide Contingency Plan in
13 September. Cleanup level document that's beneath my chair
14 in August. ARARs in August. A groundwater monitoring
15 report, September, possibly. Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 RAP
16 in September, Landfill/4 Fill Site 5 Work Plan in
17 September. So that's six big documents. We'll be busy.

18 MR. NELSON: Contingency plan is probably the most
19 (INAUDIBLE) up as well as ARARs for Fill Site 5/Landfill
20 4's higher up. And groundwater monitoring is (INAUDIBLE).

21 MR. BERMAN: Given the wealth of material that's now come
22 into the hands of the various people, it would be
23 interesting, from the less-public members, if there were
24 some systematic discourse on each one of the these,
25 because speaking of myself anyway, I'm not dumb, but I'm

Page 26

1 Because there is a wealth of data there, and as you say,
2 this is the first time that some of trends are actually
3 going to be examined.

4 MR. NELSON: For quite awhile, and we can certainly talk
5 about that at the next RAB meeting if it's timely enough,
6 or at a future RAB meeting, we can discuss some of the
7 trends that we may or may not see at some of these sites.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: One thing to watch that will be
9 interesting, there are a number of variables in addition
10 to this time passing; it's a different laboratory,
11 different sampling. Some of the nuances of sampling can
12 affect the data, and Montgomery Watson is using a fairly
13 consistent process. This was tried to mimic or duplicate
14 that, but it won't be exact. That can influence the
15 numbers. So a change at the site may not necessarily be a
16 real change, and it's something to watch as we go through
17 and try to evaluate and include a second and third quarter
18 and see what's going on.

19 MR. BERMAN: Well, this is in some sense is really
20 establishing a baseline for a lot of the data.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's reconnecting to the continuum out
22 there, and the connection may not be seamless.
23 Particularly because a number of values, we may never know
24 all the things that went into the difference. And so it's
25 just part of the interpretation. It's not an exact

Page 28

1 probably not going to read all of the report, especially
2 with the thoroughness that you're going to get from Bob
3 and Jim, so we can get some grip on all these reports,
4 other than knowing that they exist.

5 MR. NELSON: So what you're suggesting perhaps is to
6 summarize the basic information in the report and what it
7 means to the overall Presidio Program. We could easily do
8 that.

9 MR. BERMAN: And any possible controversies or changes or
10 rethinking that comes from that, what education you got
11 from reading it besides knowing there were pages and pages
12 of data.

13 MR. NELSON: Sure. I think that's a good suggestion. We
14 can certainly do that at a committee meeting, or even, for
15 instance, in a meeting like this. If we had some advance
16 planning, we could do it because we have a fair amount of
17 time to do such a thing. And I think it might be helpful
18 for those people who don't read the reports in full detail
19 to get an idea of what these documents are saying and how
20 they fit in.

21 MR. PONTON: I guess I forgot the small arms firing range
22 RI/FS, that's somewhere in here, too. No. 7.

23 MR. NELSON: It's also lower on the priority list.

24 MR. KERN: All right. Thank you. Under No. 9, any new
25 business? I do have an executive summary of a report that

Page 29

1 we're writing on Landfill E. I have it with me. It's a
2 draft that I want to give to -- it's only like three
3 pages -- to the community members for their feedback
4 before we discuss it publicly. If you'd like to review
5 that, come up afterwards. I'll give you a copy.

6 No. 10. Review of Action Items.

7 Well, Jim certainly gave us a review of some of the
8 documents that are out there. Thank you. I would
9 recommend, if you're at all interested, the ARARs or
10 the Applicable or Relevant Appropriate Requirements
11 document. It's not too thick. It's a quarter of an inch.
12 There was a lot of work put in by the Park Service and the
13 Trust in coming up with this. It will be the basis of a
14 lot of decision making. I would recommend to you -- Mark
15 and I get it because we're on the -- we get everything,
16 but I think this is something that I really recommend. If
17 it's feasible to get some extra copies, if people request
18 that. Sometime people should try to take a chance and
19 look at that. It will be in the final Feasibility Study,
20 if you want to look at that specifically in advance if you
21 have the time. And I'm sure that people would appreciate
22 feedback if you have it. They spend so much time on it.

23 MR. BOGGS: You could add to that, Chris put out a
24 challenge that nobody could add to that paper.

25 MR. BERMAN: That's why I asked if DTSC had actually seen

Page 31

1 declaration on the importance of the ARARs document, and
2 since No. 11 is about to come up on the agenda, perhaps an
3 introduction to that document could be made, in fact, at
4 the next committee meeting.

5 MR. NELSON: Sure. I think it's probably a somewhat
6 bizarre concept, but just to say ARARs, and it's out there
7 for review, but I think when you really start reading it,
8 you start to realize, and we touched upon this last year
9 when we talked about some of the things that are going to
10 happen. We've sort of been going through it with
11 Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4. What are the things that the
12 Trust has to do and what are the laws that we have to
13 comply with when we implement these remedies? So I think
14 it will become a lot more clear of what it all means if we
15 talk about it in a real world setting.

16 MR. BERMAN: I think I grasp that, and it's why I was
17 suggesting if Doug would even consider it for the
18 committee meeting, and then after the introduction, maybe
19 at that time you could have some additional copies of the
20 report that could be passed out in a meeting, and any
21 community members that come to the meeting --

22 MR. NELSON: Yes, absolutely. We also can send it out
23 electronically, either in Word or in Adobe Acrobat reader.

24 MR. KERN: I think there is also membership issues coming
25 up for our next meeting?

Page 30

1 it before and there wasn't a back room discussion before
2 the thing actually was promoted.

3 MR. KERN: And Chris' challenge is on the record, but we
4 don't have from Chris what he will give anybody if they
5 are successful.

6 MR. NELSON: I think I will give them a toothed grin.

7 MR. KERN: Another action item. The Firing Range's RIFS
8 Strategy.

9 MR. NELSON: Actually Doug, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I
10 can add to the question of ARARs in reviewing the report
11 itself. As probably many of you recall from previous
12 meetings where we talked about the ARARs and kept
13 misfiring on getting them out, there was a meeting planned
14 to talk about ARARs. And I apologize for not mentioning
15 them tonight. We haven't put it on the calendar yet.
16 Perhaps we can talk about a good time at the committee
17 meeting, and we'll get out an Email and fax to people
18 about time. We could do it during the evening, maybe make
19 it part of a committee meeting, but some of these
20 Feasibility Study meetings of this nature have to occur
21 during the day. So we'll see what we can get in the way
22 of attendance on that. But that's pending, and I wanted to
23 mention, we're still on hold.

24 MR. KERN: Thank you.

25 MR. BERMAN: In view of that, and in view of your

Page 32

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Yes.

2 MR. KERN: So there will be a review of the pending
3 applications and a recommendation at the following RAB
4 meeting. And are we currently projecting a vote on the
5 slate, at the September meeting?

6 MS. MONAGHAN: I believe so.

7 MR. KERN: Before I -- I have a few closing comments that
8 I wanted to make to our potential members that are here
9 tonight. Are there any other announcements or comments?

10 MR. CALLAHAN: I just have a question. On the radio just
11 a little while ago, they announced that they were going to
12 be (INAUDIBLE) Trust in lieu of its development, and they
13 will be tearing down Letterman Hospital and using some of
14 that material to rebuild. Now, I was wondering how they
15 managed to deal with the disposal of medical items that
16 was a problem there.

17 MR. KERN: There have been reports written both for
18 Letterman and a couple of the facilities for nuclear
19 decommission. Certainly it's not impossible that there
20 were other materials disposed of in landfills. Medical
21 waste could be anything from just-used hypodermics, things
22 of that sort, to broken glass or whatever. It could be a
23 variety of things. I don't think there is anything on
24 that site. That has been reviewed pretty extensively.

25 MR. NELSON: The Trust has also been undertaking an

Page 33

1 extensive salvage operation down there since we took over.
2 And since there was sort of a known plan for the site,
3 we've gone through and removed a lot of materials, and in
4 that process, there was a staging of hazardous materials
5 and medical wastes that were discovered -- gas cylinders,
6 bottles of chemicals and the like. And that was disposed
7 of, removed from the Presidio a time ago. The building
8 itself is going to be painstakingly taken apart and it is
9 already underway. If you've noticed out there, there is
10 cranes and whatnot. They've been doing a lot of
11 activities. Suffice it to say, when it gets knocked in,
12 there won't be anything dangerous inside.

13 MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you.

14 MR. KERN: Just a few comments for the folks that are
15 here tonight. I want to thank you for coming out. I know
16 that in the first meeting that I sat in -- there's
17 actually three original charter members here tonight --
18 about seven years ago. The first few meetings can be very
19 challenging, to say the least. You don't know who all the
20 characters are here at the table. You don't know why
21 they're saying what they're saying. It's hard to
22 understand exactly what people are even talking about.
23 But I want to encourage you to stick it out and to join
24 us, to start digging into this material.

25 This is going to be a very exciting time. There has been

Page 35

1 RAB MEMBER
2 Sam Berman
3 Bob Boggs, EKI
4 Edward Callahan
5 Jennifer Coats
6 Dennis Downing
7 Doug Kern
8 Jan Monaghan
9 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
10 Peter O'Hara
11 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
12 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
13 Joanne Chow Winship
14 Tracy Wright

15 ---oOo---
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 34

1 a lot of groundwork done -- no pun intended -- to get to
2 this point -- a lot of investigation, a lot of
3 discussion. And now some of the remedies are going to be
4 put into action, implemented. And so there's going to be
5 a lot of work, probably an equal amount of work for the
6 next seven years making sure those design plans happen
7 according to what community people would like to see and
8 staying involved.

9 It's my feeling that we're about halfway through this
10 process. I really encourage you to come back and to learn
11 more.

12 If you have any questions for any of us, we will hang
13 around after the meeting. I would like to invite you to
14 ask questions, privately if you will, for any of the
15 agency people as well. They're willing to stay. Again,
16 we have a couple of regulators, Jim and Bob, and some
17 community RAB members, Park Service people and Trust
18 people, and I encourage you to ask questions of what we've
19 done here. We're going to end early tonight.

20 Any other announcements? Without further ado then,
21 meeting adjourned.

22 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.)

23 ---oOo---
24
25

ATTENDANCE

1

2

3

4

5

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

6

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

7

PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

8

9

10

11

October 9, 2001

12

7:00 p.m.

13

---oOo---

14

15

ORIGINAL

16

17

18

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

19

BY: JUDY L. LARRABEE

20

21

22

CLARK REPORTING

23

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

24

BERKELEY, CA 94704

25

(510) 486-0700

1 PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

2 GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

3 October 9, 2001

4 7:00 p.m.

5 ---oOo---

6 MR. KERN: Good evening. Welcome to the
7 Presidio of San Francisco and the Restoration Advisory
8 Board meeting for October. I'd like to welcome the
9 Presidio Trust and their contractors, the Park Service,
10 the regulatory community, community RAB members and any
11 members of the public that are here tonight, thank you
12 for coming.

13 Are there any changes to tonight's agenda? Any
14 additions? Moving ahead. Any announcements or old
15 business? No announcements.

16 Committee reports. Tracy did a good job running our
17 meeting a couple of weeks ago.

18 MS. WRIGHT: We met on September 25th, and had
19 quite an agenda because we didn't have a September 11
20 meeting. We started with a discussion on ARARs which,
21 for the new members, are the applicable or relevant
22 appropriate requirements. This is a draft document
23 that we're looking at right now.

24 We also had a question and answer session on that.
25 Chris and Brian and George actually fielded those

1 questions. There was some talk about having a larger
2 discussion about this later on. We sort of left it at
3 that. We're going to have some sort of presentation
4 down the road, maybe later this month or next month.

5 We also had some updates from Chris and George, again,
6 that would have been on the September 11th meeting. We
7 discussed the Landfill E letter, and possibly changing
8 the focus of that, for those of you who have seen it,
9 to be a response to the (INAUDIBLE).

10 Doug also brought a recommendation to discuss findings
11 by the community members since May of 1999, and that is
12 a discussion focusing on sort of the achievements and
13 not-so-achievements to date --

14 We discussed the newsletter format. Jane said that
15 there will now be a new format with an insert for the
16 RAB, to do with it what we choose. Right Jane? And
17 then we discussed membership. And then our next
18 scheduled meeting is October 23rd. Thanks.

19 MR. KERN: Thank you Tracy. Let's move on to
20 Item No. 5. I think we need to delay our membership
21 discussion until perhaps later in the meeting, perhaps
22 when we have a few more attendees.

23 Item No. 5B, Project Status Updates, Chris Nelson,
24 Presidio Trust.

25 MR. NELSON: Thank you, Doug. Good evening.

1 For those of you who don't know me, I'm Chris Nelson.
2 I'm a project manager. My official title is
3 Environmental Mediation Specialist. Every month at
4 these RAB meetings, you'll see me talking about a
5 number of projects that the Trust is working on.

6 So tonight I would like to update everyone on a
7 variety of projects, including one that's been
8 discussed at many meetings in the past, the
9 Presidio-wide Contingency Plan. This document is still
10 being tweaked, as they say, due to some issues related
11 to both the ARARs, which are a portion of the
12 feasibility study document that tie in with a number of
13 projects that we are working on at this time, as well
14 as the Letterman Project.

15 We had a comment session with the RAB and the DTSC
16 back in July, and at this time we're basically trying
17 to get all the comments together and have the Letterman
18 remediation protocol tightened up before we can release
19 the Contingency Plan. So we anticipate release of this
20 document in draft form to the stakeholders for review
21 later this year once these ARARs issues and Letterman
22 remediation protocol are tightened up.

23 I'm also working on a project known as the Main
24 Installation Feasibility Study. It's basically an
25 analysis of --

1 MR. BERMAN: Could you just go back to the
2 previous slide there? Do you have any more updates on
3 the release of the report other than this year, at the
4 very end of the year?

5 MR. NELSON: It's probably going to be mid to
6 late November. I hope that's when we can get it out.
7 It really depends on the ARARs issue and when those get
8 resolved. We'd like to release the ARARs with that
9 report and have them be the final ones that we're
10 relying on and that the agencies can respond to.

11 MR. BERMAN: Just refresh me. Is this going to
12 have a public review of any kind?

13 MR. NELSON: We'll have both a public review,
14 Sam, as well as a public meeting to cover the raw
15 portion of the Remedial Action Work plan. It's
16 essentially similar to a Remedial Action Plan, but it
17 deals with -- this is not a Contingency Plan because it
18 deals with unknown contamination.

19 MR. BERMAN: Is there going to be a period of
20 time between the release and the first public meeting?

21 MR. NELSON: Absolutely.

22 MR. BERMAN: So there will be time to read the
23 report?

24 MR. NELSON: Yes. Generally the public comment
25 period -- Excuse me, the public meeting comes in the

1 middle of the comment period, so there will be some
2 time before the meeting to analyze the document and
3 apply some comments.

4 On to the Feasibility Study. This is a study that the
5 Trust has been undertaking for the last year and a half
6 or so, Looking at a variety of sites within what's
7 called the Main Installation. It's approximately 38
8 sites. We're trying to select a remedial alternative
9 for these sites. At the time we have some field
10 investigations that are either ongoing or proposed.
11 We'll walk you through those right now.

12 We have the soil gas investigation at Battery Howe
13 Wagner, trying to determine upgradient sources of
14 Carbon Tetrachloride. We recently removed the Gore
15 absorbers, as they are called, which are passive soil
16 gas sampling modules. They went last week to the
17 laboratory, and we should receive the results from that
18 in a few weeks. That investigation will be relatively
19 qualitative in that it provides essentially a graphical
20 representation of where the highest levels of AOCs in
21 the soil gases is.

22 So we overlay that with a GIS map that shows all the
23 buildings and all the potential sources and where the
24 contamination exists, if it does. When we get that in,
25 we'll be able to release a report for everyone to take

1 a look at. Hopefully we'll be able to find out where
2 this Carbon Tetrachloride is coming from.

3 In addition, we also have some additional data sites;
4 five of them listed here. We've submitted a Field
5 Sampling Plan, and it's being reviewed by the agencies
6 and RAB. Last week we had a meeting to talk about the
7 preliminary comments verbally with the RAB and DTSC,
8 and currently our consultant Erler & Kalinowski is
9 making provisions for that Field Sampling Plan. And
10 I'll be talking about that in detail later on tonight
11 with Item C on the agenda.

12 On the Feasibility Study Report itself, we have EKI
13 revising the document right now based on comments from
14 the Trust and NPS over this past summer. We anticipate
15 the release to the public in November, assuming that
16 they can meet that 10-17 date. Again, the ARARs is
17 another issue that needs to be cleared up, since it's
18 already been out there once. We don't want to have a
19 nonrevised version going out again with that document.
20 And I'll be giving you more updates as the time goes
21 along as to when exactly that document will come out
22 because that's obviously a big document.

23 Related to the Feasibility Study of the ARARs, as
24 Tracy mentioned, these are applicable or relevant
25 appropriate requirements. Each remedy that's select by

1 the Trust has to comply with requirements and the laws
2 and regulations governing environmental protection.
3 And there is a full analysis that's done of all these
4 different requirements that's in the Feasibility Study.
5 We released this portion of the document in August to
6 the agencies and RAB, and we have not received any
7 written comments. However, perhaps after the next
8 committee meeting on the 23rd -- I believe it's an
9 agenda item -- and we're also waiting for comments for
10 the DTSC attorney -- I'm hoping Bob can give us some
11 information on that tonight.

12 And then there will be a meeting with the Trust
13 lawyers and the DTSC lawyers in the future preceding
14 the overall -- if it's still necessary -- a meeting
15 with all the stakeholders to discuss it. We may be
16 able to flesh it out in these next few meetings.

17 There is a cleanup level document that is looking at
18 the Presidio-wide cleanup levels for soil sediment,
19 ground water and surface water. It was done in concert
20 with the Feasibility Study in order to set limits for
21 cleanup in the these environmental media. It was
22 issued in August, and we're waiting for comments from
23 Bob Boggs of DTSC. We should be getting some comments
24 next month from the toxicologist at DTSC. When we get
25 these comments, we'll revise the document and issue it

1 as final. Hopefully we should be able to release that
2 in December.

3 Before I move on to the next item, does anyone have
4 any questions on the ARARs or the FS?

5 MR. BERMAN: Presumably you don't anticipate
6 any major revisions of the cleanup levels since
7 essentially you've already selected the remedies in the
8 FS to achieve those goals, so --

9 MR. NELSON: Yeah. When you think of what a
10 document -- if there are major changes, which I doubt,
11 they will really not have a major impact on which
12 remedy we selected. It may make a difference between
13 twenty more yards of soil or something of that nature
14 if we're excavating the site, or --

15 MR. BERMAN: So you don't expect anything. So
16 the fact that the cleanup document is actually coming
17 out after the FS doesn't really make any difference.

18 MR. NELSON: We're hoping that it will be
19 improved. So that's what the FS will be relying on,
20 and it will be a worthy representation of what we're
21 looking at in terms of cleanup levels.

22 Another site that's within the main installation is
23 Landfill E, which is one of the larger landfills in the
24 Presidio. It's approximately 110,000 cubic yards of
25 materials overlaid by Pop Hicks football field which is

1 the athletic field over in the East (INAUDIBLE) area.
2 We've recently entered into some discussions with DTSC
3 and RAB at the last RAB committee meeting, and DTSC
4 requested that we do some additional investigations
5 prior to finalizing the Feasibility Study and even
6 towards the RAP. To that end, the Trust is currently
7 preparing the scope of work to ask our consultants on
8 this project, Erler & Kalinowski and Golder Associates,
9 to prepare a Field Sampling Plan. What they're doing
10 right now is compiling data gaps and looking at a
11 previous investigation to determine which data gaps
12 need to be filled in this investigation.

13 And as part of this, we're also going to include a
14 meeting with the stakeholders to discuss these data
15 gaps and how collection of additional data can help us
16 to come to a good decision on a remedy for Landfill E.

17 I understand the RAB is preparing a report or a letter
18 on Landfill E. I think that this will be a useful tool
19 in helping direct the Trust to select data gaps for
20 this investigation.

21 Based on some past communications with DTSC, we're
22 going to present a schedule of activities proposed for
23 this work to DTSC next week. Once EKI does the data
24 gap analysis, we can have a stakeholder meeting to take
25 into account any additional concerns, and the time and

1 date is to be determined at this point. But know that
2 we're trying to do all these additional investigations
3 as quickly as possible in order to get this information
4 into the RAP, so it will be within the next six weeks
5 or so.

6 MR. BOGGS: One thing along that line, for
7 Landfill E for the FSP, our resident landfill expert is
8 very, very busy, so if we can tighten down a date for
9 that, I'd like to schedule his time as far in advance
10 as I can, whenever we can do that.

11 MR. NELSON: We should have the scope of work
12 done this week, and we'll be able to pencil out a
13 schedule for the Field Sampling Plan.

14 Any questions on Landfill E?

15 MR. BERMAN: Just a minor question. Can you
16 give some indication of what the nature of the sampling
17 is going to be?

18 MR. NELSON: Well, from having discussions with
19 DTSC in the past, I believe these are the meetings
20 where the RAB is present, or at least a portion of the
21 RAB is present. There are some concerns about landfill
22 gas, for one thing; also determining the limits of the
23 landfill and issues about placement of the cap, what
24 type of cap, those sorts of things. I'm not sure if
25 any of (INAUDIBLE) issues would make of this, but I

1 know that the seeps of the total landfill may need to
2 be characterized. And we haven't unfortunately had
3 enough rain in this last calendar year to collect any
4 samples. Is that pretty right on, Bob?

5 MR. BOGGS: Pretty close. I think because of
6 past history, there's probably less concern with
7 contaminants in the seeps from the fill as opposed to
8 how that's going to affect the design, et cetera, et
9 cetera. But yes, those are some of the concerns.

10 MR. NELSON: The landfills at Public Health
11 Service Hospital Complex, Landfills 8 and 10, we've
12 been preparing for the 5-Year Review for those sites,
13 and recently received an internal Draft Work Plan From
14 URS consultants, our contractor on the project. When
15 we have a chance to review it, we'll submit it to the
16 Park Service for their review and concurrence, and then
17 we'll issue that document for review. We anticipate
18 conducting the field work early next year. Once we've
19 conducted the field work and analyzed the data and
20 interpreted it, we'll complete the 5-Year Review
21 document with the investigation results in that.
22 Hopefully that document will have some options so we
23 can evaluate what's best to do for those sites.

24 So lots of investigations coming up. That's all I
25 have for now. Any questions? If not, I'll turn it

1 over to George Ford.

2 MR. FORD: Do you want me to go through my
3 stuff, or do you want to do the --

4 MR. NELSON: Oh, other CERCLA. Is that B?

5 MR. FORD: No, I can do that. I was just
6 wondering about the bids.

7 MR. NELSON: Go ahead and finish up yours, and
8 then I'll pick up under Item C after you're done.

9 MR. FORD: Let me just sort of jump in on the
10 tail end of CERCLA and a couple of other items. We
11 sent a draft schedule to DTSC last Thursday, and we
12 have a meeting scheduled for 1:00 o'clock on the 16th
13 to talk further about this schedule, which has changed.
14 We've moved some things around after talking with Park
15 Service, and the schedule is still a draft, so what we
16 need to do so now is go through the process of making
17 it final and debugging. So we're meeting on the 16th
18 to talk about it.

19 Letterman and LAIR. LAIR is Letterman Army Institute
20 of Research, which was the really ugly building that's
21 behind the Letterman Hospital. There is some concern
22 on DTSC's part now about possible leaks below LAIR. We
23 don't really know too -- the records perhaps are not as
24 definitive as anyone would like about what went on in
25 LAIR, and what the possibility of leaks coming out of

1 the various drain systems were. So we're going to take
2 another look at that.

3 Those of you who came in the Lombard Gate know that
4 LAIR is about half gone right now, and the rest of it
5 is falling down daily. So this is a project that we
6 want to jump on quickly. Now is the time.

7 MR. O'HARA: Could you expand on the location
8 of where the leaks are? Are they downgrade, or --

9 MR. FORD: There's actually at this point --
10 Bob, you'll have to jump in here if I go into the
11 ditch -- there isn't any evidence of leaks right now,
12 but there is some concern since they did all types of
13 exotic research in LAIR. There is some concern that
14 there could have been leakage, possibly through storm
15 sewers, you know; they had various drain systems within
16 the building. We believe that most of them eventually
17 connected to the storms, I mean the sanitary sewer.
18 Scratch any time I say storm. Think sanitary. We
19 think that most of the drains were connected to the
20 sanitary sewer, and the concern is that if those pipes
21 were clay pipes or had cracks or anything, it's
22 conceivable that leaks could have occurred in the
23 sanitary sewer connections below the building. So now
24 that the building's being demolished, we will have a
25 chance to look at the sewer connections and the soil

1 that lies underneath the building, and we can
2 physically inspect it for visible evidence of spills,
3 and we can also do some sampling in the area,
4 presumably in the area of the sanitary sewer connecting
5 pipes so that we can put the issue of leaks from the
6 sewer system to rest.

7 MR. O'HARA: What sort of linear footage are we
8 talking about?

9 MR. FORD: I haven't estimated linear footage.
10 I have looked at a map, and I know that there were ten
11 separate connections, sanitary sewer connections that
12 came out of LAIR and connected to the sanitary sewer.
13 So there were seven of them on the side of the building
14 where the very large parking lot is, which I guess is
15 the east side, and there were three on the other side.
16 And so we know where all those connections were, and
17 those will be one of the first places that we're
18 looking. So we could probably develop an estimate of
19 how many linear feet of pipe were involved. It would
20 be several hundred at least.

21 MR. O'HARA: Then you're going to unearth them
22 as part of the demolition process?

23 MR. FORD: Yes.

24 MR. O'HARA: At what point does the demolition
25 stop and the investigation start, and what are the time

1 frames?

2 MR. FORD: Well, I think that the investigation
3 will be proceeding concurrently with the final stages
4 of the demolition. The ten connections to the sanitary
5 sewer and the main trunk sewer, there is actually a
6 large kind of collector sewer that ran down to the east
7 side of the building. All of those are going to be
8 removed. They will excavated out as part of the
9 demolition. One of the things we want to do is to
10 observe that when it's happening to see if there is any
11 evidence that any of the pipes leak or not.

12 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

13 MR. KERN: Earlier you mentioned exotics. Are
14 you thinking that there are heavy metals or specific
15 chemicals?

16 MR. FORD: I think as we go through the
17 literature review, we'll be able to narrow it down to
18 specific chemicals, but I don't know what they are
19 right now. But LAIR is one of those places about which
20 there are -- there's a lot of speculation. I guess
21 they had armed guards there at the entrances when they
22 were in operation. And to be honest, at this point, I
23 don't know what was used. So we have to do the
24 literature review first.

25 MR. BERMAN; Speaking of exotic substances,

1 there was a fair amount of animal research done at
2 LAIR. Some of them -- the most classified areas were
3 in places where various kinds of studies were done on
4 the animals. Presumably there had to be records of all
5 that stuff somewhere, but it's probably classified.
6 All types of research is classified. The question is:
7 Has anyone ever looked at the LAIR documentation to see
8 whether there is a certain amount of it that's
9 classified?

10 MR. FORD: That's more of a kind of a
11 project that is -- I don't know the answer to your
12 question. We're going to look at the reports and the
13 information that is available to us right now, but to
14 be honest, I haven't dealt with the issue of classified
15 information in this kind of a setting before. My guess
16 is that material that is classified will not be
17 available to us, and we will just have to work our way
18 through that issue by making some kind of sensible
19 middle-ground type of assumptions.

20 And part of it is going to be based on what we see
21 when the floor slabs come up. I've looked at a lot of
22 buildings being demolished, and when you look
23 underneath them, some of them are clean and some of
24 them are dirty. We don't know which one this will be.
25 If it looks clean and it's apparent that the sewers

1 were not leaking, it may be appropriate to just do a
2 very limited amount of sampling. If it looks like a
3 cesspool over there, then we'll address that when we
4 see it.

5 MR. BERMAN: In the past, it's been helpful to
6 know something about what went on in the building in
7 terms of sampling. It seems to me if there were
8 activities that were classified, at least we could find
9 out whether that report -- maybe we don't have access
10 to them, but I was hoping a little bit to see whether
11 there was that kind of information. Because if it
12 turns out after you look that you need to know
13 something about what was going on there, presumably
14 there are people that you can get to help you with
15 that.

16 MR. FORD: We've got to do the literature
17 compilation. The Trust has reams and reams of stuff.
18 And I know, for instance, I believe LAIR had acid
19 drainage -- the last drain pipes inside the buildings
20 that fed to an acid collection system. I haven't seen
21 them, but I understand there are reports where the
22 Army, when they vacated the building, went through and
23 had all those pipes cleaned and swabbed out. And there
24 are the reports that document that type of cleaning.
25 So I think once we get all this stuff in a pile and

1 wade through it, we will know a lot more. Whether we
2 can infer what some of the contaminants or chemicals
3 used in classified work were or not, I don't know.

4 MR. O'HARA: Just to take Sam's point one step
5 further. If you come upon a situation in which you
6 have found obvious leakage -- I'm assuming that the
7 nature of your investigation is for chemicals. But
8 what about biological issues? And at what point do we
9 make a determination to look for chemicals? Who makes
10 a determination of the biological issues, or what sort
11 of criteria you would use to run a biological
12 investigation?

13 MR. FORD: I don't know the answer to that. I
14 feel like I'm punting now on most of your questions. I
15 believe those issues we would address in whatever Field
16 Sampling Plan we put together. A Field Sampling Plan
17 for a site like that would have to make allowance for
18 the fact that contaminants could be metals or DOCs or
19 kind of the normal things, and that there is at least a
20 possibility there could be something else involved.

21 MR. O'HARA: But wouldn't you, just as a
22 established protocol or plan -- You unearth something,
23 and rather than be forced to make decisions at that
24 time, wouldn't you have some kind of a protocol in
25 place?

1 MR. FORD: We will. The Field Sampling Plan
2 will include health and safety protocols to cover at
3 least the sampling and analysis of whatever we find.
4 Typically if you find some unknown, you may not want to
5 dig it up right there. A lot of times you want to take
6 a sample and find out what it is before you start
7 moving. So the Field Sampling Plan will take us at
8 least that far. We will have a plan in place to
9 recover the samples and send them away for analysis.

10 I guess the other thing I should emphasize is that at
11 this point, we think the building is fine. What we're
12 trying to confirm, what we suspect is true, is that
13 there is no trouble out there. So we need to be a
14 little bit careful. I don't know if we'll be able to
15 have a plan in place for every single hypothetical
16 condition that we might encounter. We really expect
17 that things are going to be fine once we open it up and
18 take a look at it. But we will be proceeding
19 cautiously. If we do find something, we will be
20 sampling it and analyzing it for whatever we believe
21 the COCs are. But at this point, I don't know what
22 those are yet.

23 MR. O'HARA: When do you plan to -- Obviously,
24 we're on track here for something in terms of time.
25 When do you expect to reach that point in time where

1 you unearth the --

2 MR. FORD: The basement floor slabs are
3 scheduled to come up sometime in the first half of
4 November, and so that will be the first time the
5 interesting stuff will be exposed. What we're doing in
6 the meantime is, as any of the sewer connections are
7 exposed, we're going to survey the locations of those,
8 so that no matter what is done to the site in terms of
9 regrading or demolishing the building, we'll be able to
10 go back and find the spots where the sewers came out of
11 the building and where the sewers are connected to the
12 main trunk sewer. So I think if we have that
13 information, we'll be in good shape.

14 What we want to do is do the sampling when it's safe
15 to do it, when we don't have a wrecking ball swinging
16 around over our head. The timing issues have to be
17 worked out so that we can get exposed soil to look at
18 as a sample, but not be in the demolition contractors'
19 way. In November is when things are going to be
20 happening out there on the ground.

21 MR. O'HARA: Can we calendar something for the
22 December meeting or can we revisit this issue with just
23 an update? I'm trying to feel comfortable with your
24 assessment of what we're dealing with here. What we're
25 dealing with here is the probability that everything is

1 fine, but we wouldn't be having this conversation if
2 you didn't have some sort of an idea in mind that it
3 may not be fine, regardless of how remote that
4 possibility might be. And given the nature of the work
5 that was done there, speaking from a personal
6 standpoint, I live within a reasonably short distance
7 of that site, and I'd like to know.

8 MR. FORD: Fair enough.

9 MR. O'HARA Thank you.

10 MR. BOGGS: Just to add a little bit. One of
11 the things is, we anticipate there is a certain amount
12 of unknown materials that were used at that facility;
13 whether it's classified information or buried deep in
14 some research document, we may not know. So if there
15 are areas that appear to be grossly contaminated, (you
16 can tell when pipes really leak versus a trickle), in
17 areas where there appears to be gross contamination,
18 we'll be looking for fish (INAUDIBLE) and that measures
19 toxicity to fish. And they have to be little fish that
20 die real easy. So now, since we're dealing with a
21 certain amount of unknown, that toxicity test will help
22 access whether we have a situation that needs to be
23 looked into much deeper or not.

24 MR. KERN: Sir, if you could identify yourself.

25 MR. SUTTER: My name is Dave Sutter. I just

1 want to mention, if during the literature search or the
2 field investigations, we really came to suspect that
3 the classified work that was done there might have
4 dumped a lot of nasty stuff on the site, it isn't
5 impossible to declassify classified information. It
6 ain't easy, but it's not impossible.

7 MR. FORD: Do you have a feel for how long it
8 takes? Is it weeks, months, years?

9 MR. SUTTER: No, but I wouldn't be surprised if
10 it wouldn't take a few months. I mean, if there is a
11 clear and present indication of a bulk of classified
12 research using either chemicals or biological agents
13 had occurred there, and that there were leaks, that's a
14 clear and present danger to public health and safety.
15 So I think that maybe a declassification, if it was
16 deemed to be helpful, could be expedited. I haven't
17 personally had experience in declassifying government
18 secrets, but I do know that there are processes and
19 procedures. I just wanted to throw that out as
20 something maybe you might consider in the mix as you
21 get deeper in trying to find out what happened and what
22 risk may be present.

23 MR. FORD: I hope the project won't go that
24 way, but it's good to know that. This is like a lot of
25 other holes that we dig. We'll find what we find. And

1 we have to proceed cautiously.

2 LAIR was a building that was purpose-built for this
3 type of research, and that's one of the reasons that it
4 has or it had multiple interior drain systems. We hope
5 that they did a good job of designing the building so
6 that whatever they did was properly contained within
7 the building. But we'll find out. That's part of what
8 this look-see underneath the building is to find out.

9 There are a couple of other CERCLA tanks, I think,
10 having to do with the acid drainage system. That's
11 another one that we also need to close out. These are
12 other sites that we don't think there is any reason to
13 suspect contamination, but it's more a bookkeeping that
14 there were some tanks there, but they are no longer
15 there now. We need to administratively close them out.
16 We're putting together a schedule. We owe Bob and DTSC
17 a schedule by next week, a schedule for these
18 activities, so we will cc, E-mail that around when it
19 comes out.

20 On the Ground Water Monitoring program, we just
21 just handed the Park Service a second draft of the
22 second quarter Sampling Program. It's about six inches
23 thick, and so now would be a good point for me to make
24 a joke to Brian about not having returned with his
25 comments, since he's had it for two whole hours. It's

1 a thick document, and it will take him some time to go
2 through it. After he's had a chance to do that, we'll
3 do a final draft and then send that out for everyone
4 else to look at.

5 Table 1, which is where we propose any adjustments to
6 the next quarterly sampling, will come out the week of
7 November 12. And the next round of sampling is
8 scheduled to begin on the 26th of November.

9 Mountain Lake.

10 MR. BOGGS: Do you know if there is any
11 significant changes being proposed in the sampling
12 program?

13 MR. FORD: I don't know. I don't think so, but
14 I have to check. There hasn't been any talk around the
15 water cooler about making any changes.

16 Okay. Mountain Lake. DTSC sent a letter to
17 the PRPs, that's Potentially Responsible Parties, which
18 I think in this case, the ones listed are the Trust,
19 the Army, and CALTRANS, basically saying, "Hey, there's
20 a problem at Mountain Lake. You all get together and
21 discuss it."

22 So the plan is to have a meeting of these interested
23 parties either later this month or sometime in
24 November. So that hasn't been scheduled yet, but as
25 soon as it does get scheduled, we will let you know.

1 MR. O'HARA: Could you in two or three
2 sentences summarize the nature of the problem?

3 MR. FORD: Well, Mountain Lake has elevated
4 metal concentrations in the upper 4 feet -- in the
5 shallow sediment on the bottom of the lake there are
6 elevated lake concentrations. The Trust did an
7 investigation of these and put together a report which
8 came out a couple of months ago. Basically we think
9 that it points the finger towards Park Presidio
10 Boulevard as the probable source of the elevated lead.
11 And there are a few other metals that are elevated
12 above background. And so we think that the problem
13 originated from CALTRANS. So what's happening right
14 now is that DTSC is convening the interested parties,
15 and they do that by sending out this PRP letter that
16 basically politely invites everyone to come together
17 and meet and discuss it. Otherwise DTSC hits you with a
18 very big hammer.

19 MR. O'HARA: The hammer being?

20 MR. FORD: Well --

21 MR. BOGGS: 25,000-a-day fines.

22 MR. O'HARA: That's intentionally, of course.

23 MR. FORD: My guess is that all parties will
24 consent to come together to meet and discuss it. The
25 Trust position is pretty clear and fairly simple, which

1 is, we didn't put any lead in Mountain Lake. And we
2 think this is either -- we're willing to clean it up,
3 but we will expect reimbursement from the Army and/or
4 CALTRANS. I think in a nutshell, that's our position.

5 I'm sure there will be lots of discussion and nuances.
6 It's a fairly complicated issue. We're not expecting
7 either the Army or CALTRANS to show up with checks in
8 hand at the first meeting. It's likely to take some
9 time to get anybody to accept financial responsibility.
10 But we'll be pursuing that.

11 Mr. O'HARA: Is the cleanup dependent upon the
12 ultimate agreement, or are you going to clean it up to
13 the levels that you believe are proper, and then fight
14 it out to collect the money?

15 MR. FORD: The way it's set up right now --
16 Initially, six months ago if you'd ask me that
17 question, the answer would have been, we're going to
18 clean it up, and then go fight about the money. As the
19 back-in-the-envelope cleanup costs estimates went above
20 about 3 million dollars, (and right now they're ranking
21 in the 3 to 5 million dollar range), the Trust had to
22 take a hard look at that, and say, that is a lot of
23 money to be spending if we don't know who is going to
24 reimburse us, and when we'll be reimbursed. So right
25 now the Trust position is that we need to get some

1 clear indication as to who is going to pay and when
2 they're going to pay before we run out and start
3 digging.

4 MR. O'HARA: Does who pays affect the levels of
5 cleanup?

6 Mr. FORD: No. The cleanup will be designed
7 based on protection of human and ecological receptors.
8 The design will be done independently of who's got the
9 money so that that won't affect it. The issue of who's
10 going to pay will likely affect when the work is going
11 to be done, but it won't affect the actual design of
12 the work.

13 MR. O'HARA: My next question is what do you
14 think the time frames are? These appear to be
15 open-ended right now.

16 MR. FORD: Yeah, I'm afraid it is. Our hope
17 had originally been to clean up the lake in the summer
18 of 2002. We've already fallen off of that schedule.
19 There is really no way that we could get back onto it.
20 So it will be -- my guess is the earliest that a
21 cleanup could happen would be sometime in 2003.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Just to follow up on that,
23 though. I had understood that the dredging for the
24 restoration for the landfill wasn't the same as the
25 dredging for the cleanup. And so are you saying that

1 although it's not their fault, in fact the entire
2 restoration of Mountain Lake is going to be delayed
3 with this dispute?

4 MR. FORD: Well, the dredging of it will be
5 delayed because we took a look at that and quickly
6 concluded that you can't do two separate dredging
7 operations. It isn't a sharp (INAUDIBLE). You really
8 have to do one dredging operation that handles all the
9 sediment.

10 What the Trust is going to go ahead and do is, the
11 restoration of the banks is going to proceed along.
12 The design of the plantings on the banks is going to
13 have to be adjusted, because we have to kind-of look
14 down the road and say, "All right. At some point in
15 the next few years, we're going to need to get a large
16 dredge and a lot of other equipment down into the
17 lake." So we don't want to put the most precious
18 plants right in the area that we need to use as dry
19 (INAUDIBLE).

20 That's happening right now. The folks that are doing
21 the restoration are coming up with a revised plan so
22 that they can do as much as they can to restore the
23 banks and still leave us a driveway to get down to the
24 water to do the work.

25 Okay? All right. The Building 1065 Corrective Action

1 Plan. I just got a Draft Work Plan to do the
2 additional site characterization that DTSC and the
3 Water Board suggested that we do when we last met with
4 them on this project. We're doing the internal review,
5 and I would expect that it will come out for everybody
6 to see in early- to mid-November. So that is something
7 to put on your radar screen for fun holiday reading.
8 It's about that thick (indicating).

9 Other corrective actions. We've been trying to get a
10 few of these going, and we are in the process of
11 issuing task orders to consultants to continue to do
12 the additional characterization at the Building 207,
13 231 Corrective Action Site which is right in the mouth
14 of the Tennessee Hollow restoration corridor.

15 We have one in the works for the Commissary Post
16 Exchange to start the Corrective Action Plan there, and
17 also one for the building 1349 Corrective Action Plan.
18 Building 1349 actually wasn't built. It was a 100,000
19 gallon oil storage tank. It was right across the
20 street from Fill Site 5. After we finish cleaning up
21 Fill Site 5, we'll finish up with Building 1349.

22 We have removed 23 heating oil tanks from residential
23 units on upper Simonds Loop. We had to run up there
24 and do that because the landscaping -- the trucks had
25 started some landscaping up there and discovered a

1 couple of tanks while the landscaping crews were
2 working on it

3 We have also addressed a couple of mini-CAP sites that
4 were up in the same row of houses, and we're now
5 putting together a report on that which will come out
6 in draft, my guess is in November, and everyone can
7 take a look at it.

8 We expect to next jump to some mini-CAP sites that are
9 on Liggett Avenue. Those are historic brick duplexes.
10 And again, what we're trying to do there is keep ahead
11 of the Trust landscaping and residential unit
12 rehabilitation purposes. So we're trying to go through
13 these areas a little bit before they do, so we can
14 finish up and get out of their way.

15 And the long, in-preparation mini-CAP Work Plan for
16 Buildings 42, 100 through 104 and 951 is nearing
17 completion. It's not there. We've been through about
18 four drafts with the consultant. We think we're
19 finally getting pretty close. That should be coming out
20 in the next month or so.

21 That's it for petroleum.

22 The Skeet Range. We would like to meet with DTSC. In
23 fact, we're planning to meet, even though DTSC doesn't
24 know this, after the meeting on October 16th. We'll
25 talk about schedule for an hour and a half and then

1 discuss DTSC's comments on the Skeet Range. Our hope
2 is that we can resolve all of the issues and get an
3 approved Work Plan. We have a bid package that's
4 pretty much ready to go so that once our Work Plan is
5 finalized, we can then go out. It will take us a month
6 to six weeks to get a contractor on board, and then we
7 can do the Skeet Range cleanup.

8 MR. O'HARA: That involves taking the product
9 in the water. And aren't you going into the wrong
10 season to be doing that?

11 MR. FORD: I guess what I'd say is that I've
12 concluded that any season is the wrong season to be
13 digging down on that beach. It's a tough issue,
14 digging down near the mean lower-level waterline. It's
15 always wet down there. We will have to watch the
16 weather, but what is going to be more important to us
17 are extreme tides. If we get an extreme low tide, even
18 in December, that's better for us than a moderate tide
19 in July.

20 One of the things that we will have to do when we
21 solicit the job, we're going to let the contractors all
22 look at the plans and specs and let them see what has
23 to be done, and then ask them to tell us when they
24 would prefer to do the work. And we're hoping that
25 someone will come up and say, "Well, we can put in

1 cheap piling and do that work in the middle of December
2 regardless of tidal conditions."

3 If they don't say that, if all the bidders come back
4 and say, "It's really critical that we wait for an
5 extreme spring tide in May," then we will have to
6 regroup and decide whether we want to wait until May to
7 do the work or whether we want to change the bid
8 package.

9 MR. BERMAN: Will Crissy Field be closed during
10 this operation?

11 MR. FORD: No. If we close off the whole area,
12 there will be about 500 feet of just the beach that
13 will be closed, and we're going to require the
14 contractors keep the Promenade open so that people will
15 still be able to pass by on foot or bicycles. It will
16 be messy and noisy, but the Promenade will still be
17 left open.

18 Okay. Crissy Field Closure Sampling. We
19 Emailed out a little while ago the preliminary Fill
20 Site 7 results. That's when many of us took a walk
21 around the marsh and spotted sampling locations on the,
22 kind-of a bathtub ring around the marsh. Those samples
23 by and large came back with acceptable or acceptably
24 low levels of metals. And virtually all of the samples
25 were below cleanup levels, except for one sample that

1 had an exceedance of zinc. I don't have those data
2 with me, but we're working on that, and we'll put it
3 into a draft format and send it around to everyone to
4 review.

5 We also have another Crissy Field follow-up activity,
6 and that is we owe DTSC a follow-up letter to kind-of
7 characterize what's been done in Building 937 and
8 proposing what we think should be done to sort of close
9 the site out. There is a question about possible large
10 quantities of free product or even liquid gasoline or
11 liquid diesel in the soil underneath Building 937.
12 Today we just got a draft letter from the consultant on
13 that topic. So we're working on it. When it's final,
14 we will send it out so everybody can take a look.

15 The last item for me is Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.
16 As you may recall, we sent out a draft, kind-of a
17 preliminary draft, of the Interim Rap and Work Plan.
18 That's floating a bit now. We'd like everybody to look
19 at it and give us their comments, but it can't go final
20 until some of the ARARs issues are resolved.

21 And then there are some CEQA pieces that we still have
22 to plug in there. So the RAP is going to stay draft
23 for a little while longer until we can get all those
24 pieces plugged in. Right now, we expect that the other
25 official draft that will have the review period and the

1 public meeting associated with it will most likely come
2 out in early January.

3 The big news on that site is that the tree removal is
4 scheduled to begin October 29. It will take about two
5 weeks at each site. So basically during the month of
6 November we'll be removing the trees at both 4 and 5
7 that occur within the landfill foot print. The reason
8 we're doing it now is that if we don't begin the
9 digging, to remove the fill until February or March,
10 the bird nesting season will have already started by
11 then. And at that point, it would be very difficult
12 for us to remove the trees. Safer for us to remove
13 them in the Fall when bird nesting is not an issue.
14 That's why we're starting right around the first of
15 October.

16 MR. BERMAN: Approximately how much trees are
17 involved?

18 MR. FORD: It is roughly 30 trees at Fill Site
19 5, kind-of in a ring around the large vacant lot, and a
20 little over 50 at Landfill 4. And that's counting --
21 there are two-inchers that I'm counting as a tree, just
22 like some of the ones that are 3 feet. It's roughly 30
23 and 50.

24 MR. BERMAN: Okay. Thank you. What will
25 actually happen to those trees? Are they salvageable

1 in any way, or is there something that a paper
2 manufacturer might want?

3 MR. FORD: I think that is actually what will
4 happen to them. The brush, you know, the tops of the
5 trees will be chipped and used as mulch, and then the
6 logs will go -- the Eucalyptus logs and the bulk of the
7 wood is going to be utilized, either going off to be
8 made into paper pulp or they're used in a co-generation
9 facility to generate power. Off the top of my head, I
10 don't know where these will go. We could find out.

11 Mr. BERMAN: Assuming the contractor has made
12 its bid on the basis of the value, of the salvage value
13 of the material.

14 MR. FORD: Yeah. Actually, though, the way it
15 works, a Trust approval actually will fell the trees,
16 and I don't know the logging term for taking branches
17 off and doing the chipping of the brush. And then a
18 contractor will come and take the logs out. And the
19 deal is basically they haul the logs for free. They
20 will come and get them. We don't have to pay for that
21 service. The way they do that is by selling them for
22 paper pulp for co-jam.

23 MS. WRIGHT: Will there be any signs to alert
24 the public of the tree removal?

25 MR. FORD: Yes. Actually we have some signs.

1 They're in the mill. We're trying to work out some
2 text, and we will have some signs up before the cutting
3 starts.

4 MR. KERN: Any further questions?

5 MR. CALLAHAN: I'd just like to comment on this
6 question of declassification of materials. Maybe we
7 could request some of our congressional to intervene
8 and see if they could expedite the classification
9 procedure.

10 MR. FORD: At Letterman?

11 MR. CALLAHAN: Yeah, because two of our
12 congressional representative live close by here, and I
13 think they'd be interested. Nancy Pelosi lives close
14 by.

15 MR. BERMAN: I think that you would not find --
16 I don't think that's a procedure to follow on. You
17 first have to find out what you needed, and the Army
18 may just say, "Move in. We'll declassify them right
19 away." They've done that before. They look at it and
20 said it's totally irrelevant.

21 If you run into a problem and the Army is obnoxious
22 and refuses to give you information, then a
23 representative might intercede. If you find documents
24 and the need for documents, the Army is more or less
25 likely to give you those, unless there is something in

1 there that they were doing anthrax work.

2 MR. FORD: My personal hope is if they were
3 doing something like that, even if they can't tell us
4 what they were doing, there is some precaution that we
5 should be taking. I would hope that they would give us
6 that information. There is actually a big stack of
7 reports dealing with the closure of Letterman and LAIR.
8 I apologize for not being more familiar with those
9 right now. I think there is a fair amount of
10 information already available in the Trust Archives or
11 Trust Library and Park Service archives about what
12 happened here. I hope that when we go through that, it
13 won't seem like such a mysterious issue.

14 MR. KERN: I'm going to jump in before Chris
15 gets the floor. I want everybody to keep in mind that
16 we have this Item 5A. We have a quorum here at this
17 point, so I definitely want to come back to that and
18 get that item taken care of. So nobody leaves.

19 MR. FORD: For those of you who are not
20 familiar with the acronym FSP, it shows up on the
21 agenda as a Field Sampling Plan. And the Addendum
22 No. 4 refers to the fourth addendum to the Field
23 Sampling Plan Trust wrote last May, last July and
24 August. I'll just get right into this.

25 We have handouts for this, as well as maps, because

1 the maps that you're going to see on the screen are not
2 very easy to read.

3 MR. KERN: I want to say you're doing this at
4 the request of the RAB.

5 MR. NELSON: Right. Yes. Actually at the last
6 RAB Committee meeting, we had a request to go into a
7 little greater detail about the sampling. So we're
8 going to do that for you tonight.

9 The basis for this investigation is these sites were
10 all sites that were either poorly investigated or the
11 belief was that the amount of data that existed was
12 sufficient to say "Well, we implement the remedy which
13 is going to be digging all the soil away; we'll further
14 characterize how much is there and then make a
15 decision." That was a difficult pill to swallow. We
16 feel more comfortable with (INAUDIBLE) additional
17 characterization to be more definitive about how much
18 contamination is out there. So in some meetings that
19 we had talking about contaminants of concern at various
20 sites, background metals, et cetera, they requested
21 that we come up with this additional gathering effort.
22 We walked the sites with many stakeholders, including
23 the DTSC, the Water Board, the RAB members, Park
24 Service and Trust, and this is where we are today.
25 We're collecting data at 5 sites. The data that's

1 collected will be included as an addendum to the Main
2 Installation, to the Building Study.

3 The sites, which were mentioned before but just to
4 refresh your memory, Building 215 area, which is down
5 the Main Post route on Lincoln Boulevard near the fire
6 station. We're going to be taking some soil samples
7 there from suspected sources.

8 Building 1244 and 1245 at Fort Scott. We collected
9 soil and groundwater samples. Building 1351 at Fort
10 Scott (INAUDIBLE) collected soils and groundwater
11 samples. Building 1750 area and the Lobos Creek area
12 which is actually right across the facilities
13 operations offices; take some soil samples around some
14 suspected sources there. And lastly, we'll be taking a
15 soil boring from the 19th Facility Building 1450, 51
16 area.

17 The first site that is shown on Figure 1 of your map
18 handouts is Building 215. This is an area that was
19 formally used as a vehicle maintenance facility. We
20 believe that the current building (INAUDIBLE) is
21 different from what was there before. This building
22 appears to be (INAUDIBLE). However, there are some
23 things that we know about the basic layout and the
24 location of the building that may be coincident with
25 former sources.

1 There were two underground storage tanks removed in
2 1989. There were some hydraulic lifts within the old
3 building; there was a paint room, and then there was
4 some stained and contaminated soil found in the utility
5 trench by Trust in April.

6 And a majority of these sources were not investigated
7 by the Army. A lot of these were determined by looking
8 at the archives and historic records, etc.

9 You can see on this map, there are a lot of dots on
10 the map. The open dots are the ones that the Trust is
11 proposing to collect, and I want to comment on these
12 maps by saying to Bob, there were some comments last
13 week about making some additional samples. We're not
14 blowing you off. We just haven't (INAUDIBLE) at the
15 task yet.

16 The dark dots are borings of (INAUDIBLE) that have
17 been conducted either by the Army or the Trust. These
18 two rectangles in the lower eastern side of the
19 building represent areas where underground storage
20 tanks were removed in 1989 by the Army.

21 There are three monitoring wells that were put in, and
22 essentially they showed that no petroleum hydrocarbons
23 have leaked into the groundwater, if there are any
24 remaining sources of the soil.

25 When the Army conducted their investigation in the

1 1990s, they put in some borings around these rectangle
2 areas, and those are represented by 215S001, S002, etc.
3 They did something a little suspect. They drilled down
4 to -- fairly deep down to some areas. They got to a
5 certain point where they were snipping samples with an
6 organic vapor detector, and they smelled something, but
7 they failed to take a sample from that location. They
8 took it from above and below. So we suspect that that
9 area around these rectangles where we will be
10 installing three borings will contain some
11 contamination with the logging poles, and we'll take
12 the samples from areas that look obviously contaminated
13 from predesignated depths.

14 We are not anticipating that groundwater is going to
15 be a problem out here, as we've looked at the wells in
16 the past and seen that. So in summary, we have about
17 ten locations of two different depths that we'll be
18 sampling at. We'll be analyzing the samples for
19 primarily fuel constituents and oils, metals, PCBs
20 which may be associated with hydraulic oil, base oils
21 and paint that's still there, polynuclear aromatic
22 hydrocarbons or PAHs, and volatile organic compounds.

23 Does anybody have any questions?

24 MR. BERMAN: I have a minor question. Given
25 that it was paint work, it would be a logical place

1 that would be sealed with any Chrom 6.

2 MR. NELSON: We are analyzing for Chrom 6.

3 MR. BERMAN: The maps in the proposed analysis
4 for these sites came out in the September 13th letter
5 to Bob Boggs of DTSC which is essentially the Field
6 Sampling Plan that I'm reading from, and we'll be
7 analyzing for Chrom 6 at this site

8 The next area is Building 1244 and 1245 at Fort Scott.
9 This is a building that's essentially -- if you look at
10 the map Figure 2, you'll see Appleton Street, and
11 there's some buildings to the north of it. If you were
12 to go to the next street and then north would be right
13 at Battery Howe Wagner. So to give you an idea of
14 where this site is, it's south of that.

15 The two buildings of concern are Building 1245 in the
16 upper portion of the map, and the long, narrow
17 north/south landfill in the middle, Building 1244.
18 This site is an historical warehouse that was a native
19 plant nursery. They have a storage operation both
20 inside and out, and there are a number of raised
21 landbeds produced for propagating seeds and propagating
22 plants that are used by the Presidio.

23 The building, as you could see from looking at this
24 map, served a variety of purposes. It was a diesel
25 engine classroom, boiler room, a former toxic

1 inflammable storage area, chemical laboratory,
2 developing room and silk screen room. When we looked
3 at this site with the stakeholders in May, we found,
4 especially back in these developing photo shop rooms,
5 there were some corroded sinks and some concrete that
6 looked like it might have been compromised by some
7 acidic materials. So we got a fair number of samples
8 concentrated in that southwestern portion of the site.
9 You can see SB100 through 103 there.

10 The Army actually took samples of this site. Those
11 are the dark samples in the upper portion of the
12 Facility 1244SB01 through 03. They centered their
13 sampling on some gravel-filled trenches, and I believe
14 those were plumbed with some four drains from that
15 diesel engine classroom. They collected some samples
16 from within the sumps, and they found some elevated
17 lead. So that was the focus of their investigation on
18 the focus of the cleanup of the site, but further
19 investigation showed there some other concerns about
20 some other chemicals.

21 The plan samples at this building then included soil
22 samples from shallow and subsurface borings and
23 investigate former spec sources, and that covers -- you
24 can see a majority of the building. We've got up to
25 about 15 locations at two depths, and (INAUDIBLE) quite

1 a few constituents: Petroleum, all organic compound
2 levels will be submitted, PCB sampling in that area
3 that was suspected to have PCB transformers, PAHs which
4 can also be associated with organic contaminants such
5 as fuels and other hydrocarbons as well as PAHs
6 specifically in the area where there was a lot of
7 corroding concrete around the sinks at the southwest
8 side of the building.

9 We'll also be collecting groundwater from four of the
10 borings and bringing the samples from those same
11 analytes to determine (INAUDIBLE) as a groundwater.

12 Building 1245 was another site that was sampled by
13 the Army during the remedial investigation. However,
14 their sampling seemed to be focused on correct
15 analytes. Considering it was a flammable storage
16 building, I believe they sampled for a fairly limited
17 number of contaminants that were not actually
18 flammable, so they probably wouldn't have found them.
19 Had they done it properly, they would have analyzed for
20 the right things.

21 There were some suspected spoils within the building.
22 It's a fairly small building. It's really about the
23 size of a closet, an exterior closet-sized building.
24 But there is a hole in the center of the floor, I guess
25 presumably that drains out of the building. So we'll

1 be installing two borings -- these open borings here at
2 1245SB100 and 101 to the east of the building, and
3 looking for metals, all organics, vertical joint
4 hydrocarbons, and two different depths at those
5 locations, both shallow and deeper contamination and
6 also one groundwater sample, I believe, from soil
7 boring 101 there, to determine whether or not any
8 organic compounds were released into the soil and
9 migrated into the groundwater as well.

10 MR. O'HARA: I believe you had an installation
11 for the soil in Building 107 and 105 on the outside of
12 the building.

13 MR. NELSON: Actually I didn't. Let me see. I
14 have a table there. The chemical laboratory and
15 storage areas are 1,4,5,6,7 and 8. So that eastern
16 side encompasses a variety of potential sources.

17 MR. O'HARA: The borings inside the buildings,
18 on the south side of the buildings.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: The one on the west side helps
20 provide some kind of gradient (INAUDIBLE) triangulated,
21 and so there's one on the west side, three on the east
22 side that provide that clarity of direction of
23 groundwater.

24 MR. NELSON: 105 will be sampled for soil at a
25 shallow depth and groundwater will be at (INAUDIBLE)

1 MR. O'HARA: I'm just sort of curious because
2 the samples, at least one of them here, 107 and 105 are
3 within just a few feet of each other. I'm just
4 curious.

5 MR. NELSON: There's a lot of stuff going on
6 inside that building, and I don't recall exactly why on
7 this location that shows them so close to one another
8 like that.

9 MR. BOGGS: One reason might be that it was
10 kind of a slab construction inside the building. It
11 probably had both possibilities of the leak going
12 through cracks and stuff in the concrete or running off
13 the concrete and outside somewhere. So this way we
14 cover both possibilities.

15 MR. NELSON: If there are no more questions
16 about 1244 and 1245, we'll move on to the next one.

17 Building 1351, which is also located at the Fort Scott
18 area, is a site currently used by the Park Service for
19 vehicle storage and repairs. It was historically used
20 as a vehicle maintenance area. There are numerous
21 sources of contamination. Where it says "Former
22 hydraulic lift and underground tank," the rectangle on
23 the western portion of the building, that tank was
24 actually removed. Actually, it was not even a tank.
25 It was a ram, a hydraulic ram with a cylinder that's

1 used to lift field samplings.

2 I've actually been doing some digging and found a
3 report that documents that removal. We can include
4 that information in the Field Sampling Plan. And that
5 goes for any of these sites: If anything pertinent
6 comes up, we will include that in the rationale for
7 either not collecting more samples, or if it hasn't
8 been investigated or shows there is some problem, we'll
9 collect some additional samples.

10 If you look on that southern side of the building, it
11 shows a former acid neutralizing tank, an acid
12 resistent pipe traveling underground away from that, as
13 well as a sand and oil trap. It's a mystery as to what
14 those were used for and why they're there. The Army
15 obviously didn't look very carefully when they went out
16 and performed this investigation. They focused
17 primarily on an area where there was some oil storage
18 above-ground. And what they found, if you look at the
19 samples, all the dark samples on the east side, those
20 are primarily with contaminated metals, above the
21 cleanup level for that particular soil type. And so
22 for whatever reason, they didn't look at potential
23 sources on the west.

24 So as you can see from those borings that we have
25 proposed, we are going to take samples from ground

1 level and potential sources, and what's not depicted on
2 this map, there is some additional sources that we
3 continued, additional samples we agree to take around
4 this portion here;; take some additional samples for
5 heavy metals and see if it is extensive or if it's just
6 isolated in that area.

7 MR. BERMAN: Was this used on storage for
8 transformers?

9 MR. NELSON: No, it wasn't. There were some
10 transformers there. You can see --

11 MR. BERMAN: Excuse me. One question. I was
12 wondering in the wreckage whether it was actually used
13 as a transformer, because that might be some of the
14 reason for all of that oil on the southern part.

15 MR. NELSON: Not that I know of. My
16 understanding is that there was some concrete area that
17 was used for storing -- probably waste oil was removed
18 from the vehicles. I inspected this transformer area,
19 which is this little dot right here, and it's a
20 concrete pad. You can see obviously where the
21 transformers were, a very large electric coupling that
22 was terminated there.

23 I looked into the records of the Army sampling for
24 those transformers, and they didn't find any PCBs in
25 the transformer. There may be some comments from the

1 RAB as to whether or not there is preference to take
2 samples there.

3 MR. BERMAN: Was that because the transformer
4 wasn't actually in use?

5 MR. NELSON: Right. I haven't seen any records
6 kept that they stored PCB transformers at that site.

7 MR. BOGGS: When you looked at the concrete
8 head, did you notice if there was any staining or
9 anything from past leaks?

10 MR. NELSON: What I noticed was a bunch of
11 vegetation growing up on top of it. But there is
12 concrete. It's clear to see a concrete pad intact. We
13 have basically a soil layer and some vegetation
14 surrounding a fence, and then as you look at the bottom
15 of the fence, there is a concrete pad. It's about
16 three or four inches thick. If need be, we can access
17 the area and inspect the pad more carefully. I kind of
18 took a leap of faith that if they sampled the
19 transformers and there was no PCB, then why sample a
20 pad or a soil beneath it? That's open for discussion,
21 I guess.

22 MR. BERMAN: It's a little surprising, because
23 you would think that those old transformers -- it's
24 very rare that an old transformer doesn't have PCBs
25 associated with it.

1 MR. NELSON: Well, it could be that PCBs in the
2 past, when they sampled them, weren't using
3 (INAUDIBLE).

4 Are there any additional questions on this
5 site?

6 MR. BERMAN: If I could just pose a question to
7 Bob: From a DTSC point of view, do you trust the
8 Army's evaluation?

9 MR. BOGGS: I actually have them on my list, if
10 I ever get behind some of these other tasks of looking
11 at the PCB program more closely. I think it was in '93
12 that the Army did a pretty extensive report. They had
13 a consultant come to do a bunch of work. Compared to
14 our other bases, there is an extremely high number of
15 transformers that were non-PCB transformers.

16 So the notion has come up that sometime prior to that,
17 the Army may have retro-filled many of these
18 transformers, which was commonly done. They would
19 drain the transformer with PCB oil and put new mineral
20 oil. Usually though, when that happens, and they go
21 back and retest that oil, it still comes up with a
22 small amount of PCB in it. In fact, they can refill it
23 several times, and it still comes up with trace PCBs.
24 So it does seem curious enough that I do want to go
25 back to the reports to see what kind of detection

1 limits they have for their PCBs, et cetera, and if
2 things were done according to protocol, I wouldn't have
3 too much concern.

4 If there are areas where there looks like there was
5 considerable leakage of transformers, (I think that's
6 why I asked the question), if it looks like there was
7 significant staining, it would be cautious of us, while
8 we're out there, to grab a single sample for PCBs. In
9 the absence of what appears to be a significant leak,
10 if the Army reports some PCBs, it's probably not
11 justifiable to go through that expense and energy. So
12 yes, I share your curiosity, but there isn't any
13 indication at this point that we should disbelieve
14 them.

15 MR. NELSON: Okay. Moving along to the next to
16 the last site. This is actually the most limited of
17 the five areas where we'll be collecting samples, the
18 former Building 1450/1451 Area of the Nike Missile
19 Facility. We perform the operation and the
20 maintenance building (INAUDIBLE) center for the Nike
21 Missile site. The Army did some sampling in the 1990s.

22 If you notice the darkened soil borings on the
23 map, you can see that they did some samplings around
24 those buildings, including one right off the corner of
25 the Acid Fuel shed. The curious thing about that

1 sample is that it showed (INAUDIBLE), nickel, cadmium,
2 chromium and copper, I believe. And this was logged as
3 homoformation soils which are not generally high in
4 those metals. So there's some belief that perhaps they
5 misinterpreted the borings and the plan is to go out
6 and further investigate that area and determine whether
7 or not that's (INAUDIBLE) and the presence of those
8 metals.

9 Also as part of looking at the site and looking into
10 the records for tanks that were out here, there were
11 some concerns by the Rap about the presence of fuel and
12 the lack of sampling, and so I'm trying to tie up those
13 issues, specifically at Nike SB11 where the concrete
14 fuel pad is, and then also at the acid fuel shed. So
15 There will be some additional information in the
16 Revised Sampling plan pointing to information about the
17 tanks.

18 My records so far that I've come up with don't show
19 any underground. So that is the extent of the
20 investigation for that area. The rest of the Nike
21 facility is fairly well characterized as far as
22 contamination goes. There hasn't been any request to
23 do any additional sampling.

24 MR. O'HARA: Chris, on the groundwater
25 monitoring station that you've got, have there been any

1 indications, and I notice they're all downgradient of
2 the actual magazines. I was just wondering, have there
3 been any measurable contaminants?

4 MR. NELSON: I don't recall exactly. I think
5 they're having some impacts with groundwater at the
6 site, and I believe that the monitoring -- I know for a
7 fact that monitoring has continued this year. I can't
8 speak to a condition of the groundwater or water
9 through the magazines because they're sealed off, and I
10 haven't personally inspected them. But I know that
11 this a lingering question that people have.

12 Presumably, when we remove the contaminated sediments
13 and soils in the areas, we will get the source of
14 contamination that exists in the groundwater in those
15 wells. But I can't speak specifically to whether or
16 not there are current impacts occurring from the
17 magazine.

18 One thing you can do is when the next groundwater bore
19 comes out, you can take a look at the current wells in
20 the area and (INAUDIBLE) to see if there's been any
21 change. Or if you want, we can talk about that.

22 MR. O'HARA: That would be very helpful.

23 MR. NELSON: Are there any additional questions
24 about this sampling area? Okay.

25 Moving right along to the Building 1750 Area. This

1 was a site that was the Golden Gate Army Reserve
2 Center. The actual Building 1750 was where the Army
3 Reserve Center is. It's currently where the Trust
4 operations and departments are.

5 The Army did some sampling, albeit somewhat misguided,
6 back in the 90s. They knew there were a variety of
7 potential sources out by Building 1752.

8 If you look at figure 5, you can see a lot of
9 different things going on. A garage had storage
10 batteries, petroleum, level blueprints. There was a
11 gasoline pump and an underground tank, etc. And they
12 did a soil gas survey across a relatively limited area
13 at the site. They found one hint of a contaminant at
14 1750SB01. It was relatively non-uniform, which
15 means --

16 MR. BOGGS: Was it a TIC?

17 MR. NELSON: Yes, which means Tentatively
18 Identified Compound. It comes up so undefinitively and
19 infrequently that they can't really say for sure what
20 it is, but they can look at the gas and figure out
21 where it comes across.

22 Anyway, they went and sampled this one boring for that
23 same compound, and they didn't find anything. So they
24 said, "Problem solved." Well, meanwhile they didn't
25 really look any further or at a number of the sources

1 that are over in the eastern portion of the site, and
2 that's what the sampling tended to do.

3 Now if you were to walk out there right now, you
4 wouldn't see any of this stuff. It's all gone in the
5 northeastern corner of that fenced-in area, right about
6 where the south of (INAUDIBLE) 1750, the ARs, there's a
7 concrete pad and above-ground fuel tanks there that are
8 double-paned that were put in --

9 MR. DOWNING: By the Park Service maybe?

10 MR. NELSON: We're not sure, but it looks
11 pretty good. And then there is a hazardous material
12 storage lock that's double-contained along that same
13 fence.

14 And so the proposal is to investigate some of these
15 potential sources that may have been released in the
16 soil and/or groundwater that have not been looked at in
17 the past. Those are represented by the borings
18 1750SB100 through 103, throughout that area on the
19 eastern side of the site. Looking at all those
20 different sources and analyzing for metals, PCBs,
21 (INAUDIBLE), PAHs, all organic compounds and petroleum.
22 And we have a request by some RAB members to look for
23 MTBE. We're going to have that to dispute. We're just
24 doing soil. I think each gorge will have just one
25 sample.

1 And last week, we walked the site with Bob Boggs with
2 DTSC, and he seemed pretty comfortable with the
3 proposal. We have not seen any grumbling.

4 On the schedule, we anticipate getting a revised
5 action plan back next week Monday, I believe, with the
6 AI, and we'll take a look at it and make sure that we
7 incorporate any information on your gathering tanks.
8 And hopefully that will encompass all the comments that
9 we've gotten on the RAB and DTSC, and we'll be able to
10 get in the field by early November.

11 So, no more questions?

12 MR. KERN: Thanks a lot, Chris.

13 I'd like to check in with everybody and see if you'd
14 like to continue with Item 5A or take a short break,
15 particularly for our court reporter. Let's take five
16 to ten minutes. We'll call you. But please come back.

17 (Recess taken at 8:35 p.m.)

18 MR. KERN: Jan has done such an extraordinary
19 job with our membership and selection. There's been
20 considerable work done by the Selection Committee and
21 Trust staff that I very much appreciate. They've been
22 advertising and following up with a variety of new
23 applicants and candidates. I want to thank Jane and
24 Janet. Jan, please.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: The membership committee has a

1 roster of five new members to present tonight for
2 election. I thought I'd pass out a little two-line
3 script. I told Marybeth that I'd read it into the
4 record.

5 You have Casey Berman here, who lives in San
6 Francisco. He's an attorney with a software
7 development company, and he's a member of the Sierra
8 Club and Forests Forever. We're happy to have him here
9 tonight.

10 Willard Harris lives in San Francisco. She's a
11 retired director of nursing. She's a past chair of the
12 Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic Board of Directors, and the
13 clinic has offices here on the Presidio.

14 Joel Hermann was here tonight, and he had to
15 leave because he wasn't feeling well. But he lives in
16 San Francisco. He's a retired video editor, and
17 belongs to the Presidio YMCA and is a big hiker around
18 the Presidio. I'm sure he'll be back.

19 And then our last person is David Sutter. He lives in
20 San Francisco. He's a retired construction project
21 manager for the City of San Francisco. He's a member
22 of the Sierra Club and a Presidio hiker and biker.

23 And Cheryl Swanson couldn't be here tonight, but she's
24 our fifth and final member. And she lives in San
25 Francisco and she's a contracts manager for a

1 consulting firm, and she's a hiker at the Presidio. A
2 lot of hikers here tonight.

3 MR. KERN: Would it be appropriate at this
4 point for any of the candidates to say a couple of
5 words about themselves, if they would like to? Don't
6 be shy.

7 MS. CHEEVER: It's part a of tradition,
8 actually. We've all done it.

9 MR. SUTTER: I'll make a couple of comments.
10 One of the reasons I'm interested in participating is I
11 live above Twin Peaks, and I don't want the toxic stuff
12 from here rolling up the hill.

13 In my work as a project manager for the City of San
14 Francisco, I have had some experience with hazardous
15 waste investigations, mitigations, et cetera. So
16 that's one of the reasons I'm interested in helping out
17 at this time.

18 MS. HARRIS: As Jan said, my name is Willard
19 Harris, and I was here at the office meeting, and when
20 I left, I thought, "Oh dear me, why am I here? I'm
21 going home and never coming back again. But after I
22 talked with Jan, I decided, yes, I can come back again.
23 And one of the reasons that I'm interested, I've lived
24 in this city for over forty years, raised my children
25 here, worked as a registered nurse throughout the city,

1 and I know absolutely very, very little about the
2 environment. And when I was talking about that, I
3 thought, "With health, there is environment." So
4 health and environment go together. There is something
5 there that hopefully I can contribute. I come
6 completely as a novice, and these words you're throwing
7 around, I have no idea what you're talking about, but
8 hopefully, I'll get on with it.

9 MR. BERMAN: Hello. My name is Casey Berman.
10 I was born and raised here in San Francisco, in Noe
11 Valley. I live in Bernal Heights, but come through
12 this spot quite often. I was pulled over by an MP when
13 I was 16, so I have some nice memories here. I have
14 some around-the-world travel plans, but this is where
15 I'm going to live for the rest of my life. I remember,
16 I think it was in August, seeing the fill spot up. I
17 forgot which number. To see that return, be it in
18 three to five years or whenever it is, to see it
19 returned to its natural state for me would just be
20 phenomenal. And the World War II Memorial. I have a
21 huge investment in a number of things in my life, but
22 one of them is in this city. This is such a sparkling
23 place, so it's a no-brainer.

24 MR. KERN: Thank you very much. It's really --
25 It continues to be a pleasure to me, the new people

1 that apply to this Board. It's really been a terrific
2 Board that we have been served on, and it's a privilege
3 to be with all of you. We are certainly going to
4 welcome the new members and have you join this
5 fantastic Board that's been carrying out this oversight
6 of the cleanup.

7 Anything else that we traditionally do at this time?
8 We need a motion.

9 MR. BERMAN: I move that we accept all the five
10 members, even those that are not here tonight, to be
11 community members of the RAB.

12 Mr. Callanan seconded the motion.

13 MR. KERN: It's been moved and seconded that we
14 accept this slate of new members to the Presidio
15 Restoration Advisory Board. All in favor say aye.
16 Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much, and
17 welcome to the RAB.

18 You will soon be getting your first collection, if you
19 haven't already, of many documents to read. I am sure
20 you'll get lots of help at any point from those of us
21 on the Board and the Trust staff, and Park Service
22 staff are here to help you up to speed.

23 Let's take a look at Item No. 6 then please, Bob.

24 MR. BOGGS: I'll give you a quick little
25 update. We have a number of documents in review at our

1 agency right now, a couple pretty critical. I just got
2 back the Human Health comments on the Cleanup Levels
3 Document. They seem to be rather minor comments,
4 nothing that is a show-stopper that's going to change
5 anything significantly.

6 We also have an ARARs document in review. Our legal
7 has had a little bit of delay in reviewing that. I've
8 talked with her today, though. Our legal department
9 does not have any major concerns. At this point she's
10 just glanced at it. The way our attorney is heading is
11 to try and just handle the issues on a staff level at
12 this point.

13 Also what we're working on right now is finalizing the
14 touches to the CEQA documentation for Landfill 4 and
15 Landfill 5, and that's something called an Initial
16 Study and Negative Declaration. And those this week
17 will be going to another state agency for completeness
18 review, and they will come back to us in draft form,
19 and then it will go out essentially concurrently with
20 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 RAP.

21 There has been some discussions at the management
22 level at DTSC in that because we are kind-of delaying
23 the Interim RAP for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 to get
24 more concrete with the ARARs and Cleanup Levels
25 Document, the question that came up essentially is, if

1 we finalize and approve the ARARs and Cleanup Levels
2 Document, it essentially would not be an interim RAP.
3 It would be a Final RAP because essentially all the
4 criteria would have been approved and accepted. So
5 that's a possibility. How do people want to proceed?

6 The last thing that I just wanted to bring up was
7 Landfill E. Like I said, because our state expert is
8 -- yeah, one guy -- and he could cap anything in the
9 state, supposedly, we need to coordinate as closely as
10 possible his reviews and stuff with anything we do for
11 Landfill E, because he could be a bottleneck in that
12 whole process.

13 MR. NELSON: Bob, on the FS RAP recites where
14 your (INAUDIBLE) portions of another site, Fill Site 6
15 comes to mind, or a soil cover or Howe Wagner
16 potentially. Would be (INAUDIBLE) knows, so that could
17 be a potential bottleneck as well, or is it more like
18 a rigorous style cover?

19 MR. BOGGS: It's going to be more the rigorous
20 style cover. Any place where you get into soil
21 plasticity and the real technical end, not just
22 covering something, but something that's, I mean,
23 there's a lot of stuff with him that he would look at
24 at Landfill E that he wouldn't look at if they were
25 capping a gas station. So anything that is a

1 significant landfill.

2 Mountain Lake was brought up. Pretty much
3 everything else was brought up. Thanks.

4 MR. BERMAN: Bob, I have two minor questions.
5 One is it says here your soil cap person has procedures
6 for looking at seismic safety.

7 MR. BOGGS: Yeah, exactly. It's part of the
8 analysis that has to be done for the landfill. See,
9 for E, he wouldn't just be looking at the cap design.
10 He'd be looking at the landfill design itself which has
11 a steep slope on the front -- "Oh, that needs to be
12 drawn back." He'd be looking to depth the bedrock,
13 i.e. are they going to be able to put a footing into
14 that, to tow that landfill anchored in the bedrock and
15 make it earthquake safe. There's actually a whole list
16 of criteria that he's going to be concerned with for
17 the landfill and its cap. So it will be both of those.
18 He's a PhD in soil science and has a BS in geology.
19 Supposedly lots of expertise behind him.

20 MR. BERMAN: Again, a minor question. Do you
21 have a response to the PRP letter yet?

22 MR. BOGGS: No, we have not heard. We could
23 have responded. It was actually signed by my boss. I
24 was put on there as a contact, but I haven't heard from
25 CALTRANS yet. For those of you who would know him,

1 Ramy Fuentes, he is at CALTRANS, and he may be working
2 on this project.

3 MR. KERN: Those of you who don't know Ramy,
4 Ramy worked in Bob's position probably for five years
5 and then went to CALTRANS. It would be rather amazing
6 for him to be recycled back into this project in a
7 different agency.

8 Bob actually worked for a different agency prior to
9 his working in this position, because once you get
10 here, you can't get away.

11 MR. NELSON: It's like Hotel California.

12 MR. KERN: Thanks Bob. Any other questions for
13 Bob? All right. No. 9. New business, in any case.
14 Anything anybody wants to bring up?

15 MR. NELSON: I know there was a question about
16 acronyms at the last meeting. I Emailed out a list.
17 For those of you who did not get it or still need it, I
18 will be glad to know who you are and mail it to you. I
19 am sure it is very helpful to have it handy when we're
20 reviewing some of these documents. As Willard
21 mentioned, a lot of this stuff is going right over your
22 head. It's not surprising.

23 MR. BERMAN: I hope that you also will Email it
24 to our new members if they have electronic capability.

25 MR. NELSON: It's important to point out that

1 any document we send out that's of significant length
2 has an acronym list that refers specifically to
3 acronyms within that document. But in this case, there
4 was a Field Sampling Plan, and I think the ARARs
5 section, which was a portion of the FS, and there was
6 no corresponding acronym list that had been
7 distributed. So we tried to remedy that situation.

8 MS. WRIGHT: Is there a general acronym list
9 for a RAB meeting? If it can be put together, our top
10 25 or 30 acronyms?

11 MR. NELSON: I think we can maybe put together
12 a glossary list or something like that.

13 MS. WRIGHT: That would be even better.

14 MR. NELSON: A glossary and an acronym list can
15 be helpful to refer to for the rookies.

16 MR. FORD: The other thing you can do is just
17 call us. When one of us starts to slip into
18 acronymese, just say "Hey, wait a minute." We can stop
19 because for most of us, you know, we just do it all
20 day. We don't even think about it, and I can
21 understand. Some of this stuff is unintelligible if
22 you weren't around the office talking about it all day.

23 MS. CHEEVER: In that regard, I'd just like to
24 suggest that list is helpful at meetings like tonight
25 both in honor of our new members, who are very welcome,

1 and also in honor of members of the public, who we hope
2 will come in increasing numbers as there is some
3 announcement of our meetings, that you try as much as
4 possible not to use acronyms without explaining what
5 they are, such as ARARs.

6 And another thing that's very helpful, when you make a
7 presentation going over where these are, if you could
8 have a general map of the Presidio, and at the
9 beginning of each talk about the site, key back to
10 where on the map it is. Again, thinking about how we
11 do like to think of this as being a forum for the
12 public to come and find out about the Presidio.

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: I have a new issue, I guess. Is
14 there anyone here that's doing comments on the PTIP
15 process? Do you want me to explain what PTIP is?

16 MS. CHEEVER: I am very involved in PTIP on
17 several committees I'm working on. PTIP is the
18 Presidio Trust Implementation Plan. Actually there is
19 some discussion about whether it really is an
20 Implementation Plan, or whether it's a very general
21 Land Use Plan, but it's an extremely important process,
22 as I guess our Trust colleagues on the this Board could
23 say perhaps better than I. Well, it's both described
24 as a replacement and as an updating of the extensive
25 plan that was put out in the General Management Plan

1 Amendment prepared by the Park Service in 1994. And
2 having worked on some comments for some other groups, I
3 wouldn't mind having RAB members make some comments.
4 And maybe other people here have some comments that are
5 relevant on the area of Landfill E, the area of the
6 Nike missile site, and the MacArthur housing area.

7 I think we could make comments such as, "These are
8 areas that we have spent a lot of time thinking about,
9 and we would like to recommend the Trust's preferred
10 alternative, which is also known as the Draft Plan,
11 take into account our X, Y, and Z considerations." We
12 could say it even more strongly that they do such a
13 thing.

14 I wasn't prepared to say this, but I'm so
15 involved in this, this is what's on top of my mind. I
16 also think that there may be people on the RAB who are
17 not as involved in that as others are. As our new
18 members may or may not know, often when we comment on
19 documents, and usually it's actual cleanup documents,
20 sometimes we circulate a RAB comment. But I don't
21 think we've ever commented officially as the whole RAB.

22 What we've done is, we've said, "The following 21 RAB
23 members, in one case, or the following (INAUDIBLE)"
24 like you only get five members agree on this. We would
25 never presume, unless we had a complete unanimous vote,

1 to make a comment of the whole Board. And I would
2 certainly not want anybody -- If we draft a proposed
3 comment, I would sure not want anybody who didn't feel
4 involved with this to sign onto it.

5 So I guess I would propose that those of us who are
6 interested could draft a comment, and then any
7 individuals who also felt very involved and interested
8 could sign on. It might be only two or three or four
9 or five. But I do think that we are a group that has
10 been very involved in the Presidio, spending a great
11 deal of time on it over the year, for many years, and
12 it really makes sense that we should raise some of our
13 expertise and background to weigh in on this.

14 And for the new members, I'll just mention one way
15 we've done this successfully in the past is by Email.
16 Somebody drafts something; we circulate it by Email;
17 people send in comments to the person or group who are
18 working on it, and then we come up a with a final
19 thing. We circulate that again, and we sign on to it.
20 We also sometimes discuss it in our committee meetings
21 which are held on the fourth Tuesday of the month.

22 if we do this though, we have to work fairly quickly
23 because the deadline for comments is October 25th.
24 Well, now I've said what I had on my mind, but maybe
25 other people have things on their mind too. Does

1 anyone else have a thought about a possible comment on
2 this?

3 MR. DOWNING: Not a comment, but isn't there
4 another public forum on it next Tuesday the 16th?
5 6:00 o'clock I think?

6 MS. CHEEVER: It's from 6:00 to 9:00 on Tuesday
7 the 16th, and I believe it's at the Officer's Club.
8 Does that make sense? There's actually a number of
9 public forums, but the one on the 16th is the last one
10 in which the Trust itself is actually having a staff
11 there to accept comments.

12 Do any of the colleagues here have a comment about
13 whether it would be good for us to make a few comments?

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: If anyone has comments that
15 pertain to the environmental community, just submit
16 them to Julie or I, and we'll see what we can work out
17 on the (INAUDIBLE)

18 MS. WRIGHT: I think it would be a great idea.
19 Would it be helpful to try to meet before or after the
20 meeting on the 16th to try to meet, or do you think
21 just to --

22 MS. CHEEVER: No. I think we could meet.
23 When?

24 MS. WRIGHT: I wonder if we could do it either
25 right before or after the PTIP meeting this week?

1 MS. CHEEVER: Is anyone available to meet?

2 MS. WRIGHT: Well maybe we can set something up
3 by Email.

4 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

5 And I guess you new members, you may not feel ready to
6 plunge into this, because it's even a little bit
7 peripheral to our usual main purpose and focus, but if
8 Jane has your Email -- do you all have Email?

9 MR. SUTTER: (Nods his head negatively.)

10 MS. CHEEVER: You don't. Well, then we can
11 communicate by fax. But if we have your contact
12 information, we can try to include you immediately in
13 the loop.

14 MR. SUTTER: Please do.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Although I want to emphasize this
16 is actually a little bit aside from what our main
17 mandating goal is. It's just that it's so important
18 and so closely related to it, I think it's worth doing.

19 MR. BERMAN: I have a kind of concern about
20 this, because in the sense, we have a certain mission,
21 the RAB mission. You said some very important things
22 that we've experienced in dealing with the Presidio.
23 We're probably one of the few community bodies that has
24 been active over a long period of time in Presidio
25 activities.

1 But the question is: We don't have -- We're not
2 designated by any law. The law that required the RAB,
3 that makes us a vital part of the remediation process,
4 doesn't apply to PTIP. So in a sense, it's sort of an
5 ad hoc comment coming from the RAB.

6 But the RAB thinks things through over a long period
7 of time, and if we ventured into this, and I'm just
8 speaking privately because I haven't thought about it,
9 but if we venture into this and we comment as the RAB,
10 or as part of the RAB, then we should really be careful
11 that we don't undermine what our principal activities
12 are.

13 And also, we have to preface our remarks as a
14 concerned public and also part of the RAB. But we
15 don't have the legal mandate that we have in the RAB
16 case. So given the short period of time that's left to
17 comment, I wonder if we can do this. Certainly we can
18 do this as individuals, but can we really do this as a
19 portion of the RAB?

20 MS. CHEEVER: I have a partial answer to what
21 you're saying, but I hope other people will jump in. I
22 hope that what I was saying before already made clear
23 that we would be doing this as individual members of
24 the public who happened to be members of the RAB and
25 then maybe because we work together, we're making a

1 joint comment because we have these comments.
2 Definitely I think -- Well, people who know the things
3 I've worked on before, know that I am extremely
4 cautious, and I would heed what you say and be sure to
5 make that clear, which I hoped I was planning to do
6 anyhow.

7 But that may not totally respond to what you're
8 saying, so maybe somebody else has a comment.

9 MR. O'HARA: Julie, I've got a comment on it.
10 I think that this organization is mandated to do
11 certain things. We all have opinions on the Presidio,
12 and I dare say that some of those opinions, when it
13 comes to land use or the political aspects of the
14 Presidio, would be somewhat divergent. I think
15 everybody that is interested should comment on the
16 PTIP, but I think it should be done outside of this
17 organization.

18 This organization exists for the purposes that is
19 covered by our mandate. And I don't feel comfortable
20 stepping outside of those guidelines. As a private
21 individual, absolutely, and I have and I will continue
22 to. But I leave that at the front door when I come in
23 here. I would suggest that we not approach the PTIP
24 with comments from this body. It's just something I
25 don't feel is appropriate.

1 MR. KERN: I think if I were to add one
2 comment, if there were items that seemed to somehow
3 intersect between the cleanup and what is proposed in
4 PTIP, then there would perhaps be a reason for this
5 group, and a strong reason, for this group to comment.
6 But I would

7 agree with Peter and Sam.

8 And I think really what you're saying Julie, as well,
9 if there is something that needs to be reconciled
10 between the programs, it would be appropriate for the
11 body to make some sort of comments.

12 MR. O'HARA: The intersection that I've thought
13 about is the land use difference from what cleanup
14 levels can dictate.

15 MR. BERMAN: That is a comment that we would
16 make after the fact. When the land use decision was
17 made, we review it and argue what the (INAUDIBLE)
18 cleanup was not appropriate for that. That's sort of
19 not being proactive. That's really reverting to our
20 goal, as is appropriate for the particular Land
21 Management Plan.

22 MR. KERN: Well, without being specific about
23 any of our comments, maybe since we're a little bit in
24 the abstract, if there are comments, circulate them and
25 see what comfort level people have. That would be --

1 MS. CHEEVER: That's possible, but I want to
2 respect what Peter and Sam are saying, which is, I
3 think, you're not even comfortable with the comment
4 that would say in effect, we're members of the public
5 who also happen to be members of the RAB, and here are
6 some thoughts we have. It sounds like you don't even
7 want that. And if the majority doesn't want that, or
8 even a substantial -- any part of the RAB doesn't want
9 that -- then maybe we shouldn't bother to go to the
10 effort drafting this (INAUDIBLE). I'd rather get a
11 sense of what the majority feels.

12 MR. BERMAN: I think Doug has really pointed out
13 that it depends upon what, to a certain extent, of what
14 you're going to say, whatever the material is that you
15 want to associate with the RAB. It's hard to give a
16 blanket feeling because you may have something that is
17 appropriate for the RAB to identify with. So it really
18 comes down to the details, to a certain extent.

19 MR. BOGGS: So in a way, we might be asking you
20 to be a sentinel for the RAB, i.e., when you're dealing
21 with the PTIP process, if you note something that is of
22 a particular environmental concern, a concern to these
23 people here in our mandate, bring it up to our
24 attention, and then we can decide whether we're going
25 to take a unanimous stand to address this issue. But

1 outside the specific environment issues, we should
2 probably approach it as individuals. But if there is a
3 specific environmental issue, please bring it up to our
4 attention.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I have a question. Does
6 anybody else have any thoughts about this?

7 MR. BERMAN: I just want to clarify. I know
8 that you are very conservative and very concerned about
9 this issue. Is the idea that to say that you are a RAB
10 member is to indicate that you have a high level of
11 concern about decisions about the Presidio? So it's
12 not as if you're going to use the RAB in its formal
13 sense, but just acknowledge that you're a member,
14 you're an active member of a concerned organization?

15 MS. CHEEVER; To what you just said, yeah. But
16 actually I sort of outlined what some of the concerns
17 are there. Actually, I can't say that it has to do
18 with cleanup. It's more because of thinking a lot
19 about the cleanup, one has developed thoughts about
20 these things. For example, with the Nike Missile Site,
21 our work, including some research that RAB members did
22 that initiated the (INAUDIBLE) cleanup that you're
23 talking about, has caused us to realize how important
24 that site is in fitting in with the Nike Swale wetlands
25 and protected species there. Not really the Draft Plan

1 very explicitly, but the Environmental Impact Statement
2 that has more details about the Draft Plan, shows that
3 there is, something like an institutional/something
4 else recreational -- do you know Doug? -- land use for
5 that site.

6 MR. KERN: There is a coding for that site
7 that's institutional/residential.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Right. But actually, it's also,
9 if you look at the impacts on wildlife or something,
10 they say explicitly within the (INAUDIBLE) the use of
11 this area would change from EISGNPA and it would have
12 an impact on protected species, wildlife, and the
13 health and movement of the California quail.

14 Well, if I were to make a statement consistent with
15 other statements I've made, I would just say that
16 because of studying this site, I have strong concerns
17 about changing the land use of it. Likewise with
18 Landfill E. I don't think it really specifies a land
19 use for Landfill E, but it does seem like the land use
20 affects some of the thoughts we've had about whether
21 one wants to restore the original -- whether the
22 environmental cleanup would also restore the original
23 topography of Landfill E. And same with their issues
24 about the MacArthur housing. But I can't say that it's
25 directly about our cleanup issues. It's more the

1 things we've thought about while thinking about cleanup
2 issues that caused us to raise these concerns.

3 Any other comments by anyone else?

4 MR. SUTTER: Yes. I just wanted to -- as a
5 freshman to this group, it's interesting to hear the
6 different arguments. It would seem to me that to get
7 into policy areas, for RAB to get into policy areas,
8 would put it on the slippery slope of becoming
9 potentially politicized. I think that's just something
10 that everybody needs to keep in mind. The things like,
11 to me, the primary focus and mandate of this
12 organization is to assist the Trust in developing
13 effective appropriate cleanup land reuse programs and
14 recommendations. I think to get into policies, other
15 than as individuals, it would be very difficult for the
16 RAB to move forward on this primary mission if it gets
17 involved in land use questions above and beyond what
18 Julie suggested, and what you suggested Doug. Unless a
19 specific intersection that proposed land use would
20 require a cleanup that would be half a billion dollars,
21 those kinds of questions and issues would be
22 appropriate for the RAB to input to the PTIP process.
23 I think we ultimately have to be very careful about the
24 potential for this body to be politicized, how far it
25 goes beyond the technical course of the issues involved

1 in the necessary cleanups.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: As an individual, I would like
3 to be able to share with other people (INAUDIBLE) on
4 PTIP, but I would be responding to the PTIP as an
5 individual. But it doesn't mean that we can't all sign
6 the same letter. We just don't have to associate it
7 with the RAB.

8 MS. WRIGHT: I kind of agree with Jan. I think
9 that I agree it shouldn't be officially from the RAB as
10 a body, but I would like to continue discussing the
11 issues, especially in the light of what we do here,
12 and maybe deciding if we want to write a letter as an
13 informal group that just happens to be in the RAB, or
14 as individuals, I still would like to proceed using
15 that approach.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Well, do you two think the letter
17 should even mention that we are RAB members, or should
18 it mention that we are RAB members but we emphasize we
19 are not speaking for the RAB?

20 MR. O'HARA: I would suggest that you not.
21 Individually, if you wanted to introduce yourself and
22 say something about yourself as a citizen commenting
23 and that incidentally you happen to be a member of the
24 RAB, that's one thing. But to collectively write
25 something in which we incidentally happen to be

1 Restoration Advisory Board members, I think that if
2 it's more than one individual in the letter, it tends
3 to characterize your intent as to be speaking for the
4 RAB, either formally or informally.

5 Our mission is here is based on science and the law.
6 PTIP is political, and the land use. And there is a
7 chasm between the two issues with the exception of
8 where land use conflicts with science and the law.
9 Otherwise they are as different as night and day.
10 They're still very strong issues.

11 I'm not suggesting that we divorce ourselves from the
12 issues, but I don't think that tying this group as a
13 body, either formally or informally to PTIP, is the
14 right thing to do.

15 MR. KERN: Any other comments? Final comment?

16 MS. CHEEVER: Nothing, except that, I can
17 accept that. And by the way, I didn't even initiate
18 this discussion. I guess I just plunged into it
19 because I am so involved. I do have a way to share the
20 thoughts that I and some other people developed so far.
21 I also, just as a citizen, urge people to be involved
22 with this. And if you go the Presido Trust website,
23 you can actually find out more about both the proposed
24 plan and the (INAUDIBLE). Can you link that together?
25 I think you can also find more information about that.

1 The hearing is on the 16th from 6:00 to 9:00. I have
2 a way of sharing any information I have, so I'll do
3 that.

4 MS. YAROS: I can understand Peter's concern
5 and Sam's, but it's also true that we're allowed to
6 have an opinion, too. Well, individually, of course we
7 are. And that goes without saying. But I don't know
8 that there's such a conflict in the RAB, even though we
9 have a vision for rehabilitation and cleanup, that this
10 body can certainly have an opinion too without veering
11 too far. Perhaps if we don't have an opinion, it might
12 mean that we're somewhat mindless of what's going on.
13 There's that side to it, I think, that maybe Julie has
14 already picked up, and wants us to be aware of.

15 People who think have opinions, and to deny that we do
16 is a lie.

17 MR. KERN: Well, this has been, as always, a
18 challenging discussion. We always carefully consider
19 these things and debate them. It's not totally clear
20 to me where to go with it. The proposal to sort of
21 send something around might still be valid just to see
22 if individuals want to deal with them. That might be
23 the best way to go at this point. If there are
24 comments that people have that they want to make other
25 people aware of, distribute them around the Email

1 chain, and people can deal with it at they choose.

2 MS. WINSHIP: Would it be okay for individuals
3 to come together and write a letter to acknowledge
4 either informally or as a group whose members happen
5 to be RAB members, but it's not representative of RAB
6 as a body, as long as we have that caveat?

7 MR. KERN: I think Peter has a comment on that.

8 MR. O'HARA: If you as an individual wanted to
9 write a letter and introduce yourself as a RAB member,
10 that's one thing. Once more than one person does it,
11 like two signers on the letter, it's a collaborative
12 effort between the two members of the RAB. And why do
13 you want to get that kind of a headache?

14 We've got a certain amount of credibility with the
15 members of the Trust that we're dealing with, and if
16 other members of the Trust see something that like,
17 they'd say "Who the hell are these people? What are
18 they doing? What do they want?" I'm not sure that's
19 where we want to go.

20 We've got a job to do here. It's big enough. I would
21 encourage you, if you want to make some comment on
22 PTIP, to go ahead and do it, but to bring this body
23 into it, to me, it's a huge mistake.

24 MS. WINSHIP: I just wanted a clarification
25 from the membership.

1 MS. WRIGHT: I think also, if the letter did
2 address that directly, and if other people circulated
3 it, how would you feel? Would that change any of your
4 thoughts about whether or not a few people could still
5 write a letter?

6 MR. O'HARA: It's not a question of whether a
7 few people could. I do not believe that it is the
8 proper thing to do in the long run to make that
9 association on more than just an individual basis. If
10 you want to do it, I'm not the censor police. Go ahead
11 and do it. My opinion is that it is the wrong way to
12 make a statement.

13 MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

14 MR. KERN: Peter's not saying don't circulate
15 things. He's stated his opinion forcefully as always.
16 I think people should proceed as they want to,
17 understanding the environment that we're in. It
18 doesn't seem like we're going to submit a formal RAB
19 letter, so I think people should circulate comments and
20 then figure out what they want to do.

21 MR. BERMAN: If I could make a suggestion here,
22 this is an extremely interesting issue in that I don't
23 think we should let the issue disappear. I'd like to
24 recommend that maybe on future committee meetings we
25 discuss this, because there are pros and cons here.

1 People might have strong feelings, but a lot might
2 depend upon the particulars of an issue. I just feel
3 that this is a big enough issue that I don't think that
4 we should close it. Peter has made a definite
5 statement; it's not a motion yet but a draft to be
6 considered. Therefore it's important enough that I
7 believe we should discuss it more and feel comfortable
8 that we've thought it through with sufficient clarity
9 and that we could have a certain amount of unanimity.
10 I would feel this is an issue where a high level of
11 unanimity really is desirable.

12 On a minor thing, on New Business, I understand that
13 we would not be meeting here at the Golden Gate Club
14 any longer. Is that right, Jane? Our future meetings
15 will all be at the Club?

16 MS. PACKER: We'll be meeting at the Officer's
17 Club. Actually, there's two meetings next year that
18 we'll be meeting here at the Log Cabin; from here on
19 out, we will be meeting at Building 350, in the
20 Officer's Club. I'll send around directions for those
21 of you who don't know where it is. Same time, same
22 date, on the second Tuesday of the month.

23 MR. BERMAN: Will that be upstairs?

24 MS. PACKER: It will probably be in one of the
25 former side rooms where they usually have the big

1 public forums. I'm not quite sure. I'll send out an
2 Email.

3 MS. YAROS: The committee meeting though stays
4 at Building 1750.

5 MS. PACKER: Yes.

6 MR. KERN: I'd like to move on, if I can, to
7 Review of Action Items. We have to get in our Landfill
8 E letter now, focusing on the Field Sampling Plan. We
9 need to do that right away to formally process that.
10 So we'll get that hopefully circulated very soon. And
11 everybody's been very responsive. I think we all sense
12 there is some urgency to get that done.

13 Future meeting agenda items. One request by Peter was
14 an update on LAIR demo sampling, whenever that's
15 appropriate.

16 An update on the Nike groundwater sampling -- perhaps
17 when that sampling happens in November relating to
18 previous groundwater.

19 There are probably a couple of other items
20 (INAUDIBLE). But we'll get those agenda items marked,
21 and then when we have a committee meeting, we can
22 always review any comments that people want to make at
23 that time, if you still want to have the discussion.
24 Are there any other announcements?

25 I do want to recognize a few people. The

1 person that does the sound; he just left. I wanted to
2 give him a little thanks for his good work, and our
3 reporter tonight. I thank the RAB members for being
4 out here and your continued participation. And tonight
5 -- especially if you were the agency folks who come out
6 and listen to us and to respond to our comments --
7 they're out here on a week night, away from their
8 families. We just want to say we appreciate it. Thank
9 for being here and helping us understand this problem
10 as we're working through it.

11 With that, if there are no more agenda items, meeting
12 adjourned. Thank you.

13 (Whereupon meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.)

14 ---oOo---

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 RAB MEMBERS
2 Sam Berman
3 Bob Boggs, EKI
4 Edward Callanan
5 Julie Cheever
6 Dennis Downing
7 George Ford, Presidio Trust
8 Doug Kern
9 Jan Monaghan
10 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
11 Peter O'Hara
12 Jane Packer, Presidio Trust
13 Sharon Reackhof
14 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
15 Joanne Chow Winship
16 Tracy Wright
17 Gloria Yaros
18 Mark Youngkin
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 1

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB
PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

November 13, 2001
7:00 p.m.

COPY

Page 3

about three or four years, and I promise not to get in Doug's way.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm Mark Youngkin, and I'm a community member and community co-chair. I've been a member since 1996, and I'm a neighbor. I live on Clay and Presidio.

MS. YAROS: I'm Gloria Yaros. I'm also a community member, and I've been on the board for a little over a year.

MR. BOGGS: Bob Boggs. Cal EPA.

MS. WRIGHT: Tracy Wright, community member since '97 or '98, and I'm also a neighbor.

MR. FOTTLER: Matthew Fottler, community member, and on the Board since '96.

MS. CHEEVER: Julie Cheever, community member since 1996. And Ford with the Trust since.

MR. FORD: George Ford, with the Trust since 1999, and I'm the manager of Remedial Construction. And I should also, while we're going around, let me do a quick introduction. On my left here is Craig Cooper who is the new Remediation Program Manager at the Trust who started last week. We've been introducing him to the various projects. He'll do a little more complete introduction of himself a few minutes into the program.

Page 2

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

November 13, 2001
7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

MR. KERN: Welcome everyone, to the November, 2001 meeting in a new location. A bunch of new RAB members tonight, and so it seems like it would be a fitting thing to do to go around the room and do some introductions again. Some people may not know everybody that's here. There's room at the table, Jim. We see you over there.

I'm getting a little interference from Sam. He's sitting right next to me. It's going to be a difficult meeting.

I'm going to start. I'm Doug Kern. I've facilitated meetings now for a little while, in fact, two years. I'm a community member of the RAB.

MR. BERMAN: I'm Sam Berman, and I'm a community member of the RAB. I've been here for

Page 4

MR. ULLENSVANG: Brian Ullensvang with the Park Service.

MR. BERMAN: I'm Joel Berman. I'm a neighbor. I'm a new member.

MS. PACKER: I'm Jane Packer with the Trust. I'm the Community Relations Director.

MR. NELSON: Chris Nelson with the President Trust since 1999, and my favorite color is blue.

MR. O'HARA: I'm Peter O'Hara, and I'm a community member and a neighbor and on the Board since 1994.

MR. DOWNING: Dennis Downing, community member for a little over a year. I live in Marin.

MR. ANDERSON: Jerry Anderson, a community member. I live in San Rafael.

MS. HARRIS: I'm Willard Harris, community member and a new person. I live in Haight Ashbury, or the lower Twin Peaks or the Valley, take your pick.

MS. MONAGHAN: I'm Jan Monaghan, a community member, and I'm an original member from '94 as well, and I live in Pacific Heights.

MR. MILLER: Scott Miller, also a community member from the beginning, and former

1 tenant of the facility here.

2 MR. SUTTER: Dave Sutter, and I'm a new
3 community member. I live up in Twin Peaks.

4 MR. PONTON: I'm Jim Ponton, and I'm with
5 the Water Board, and I live here in Twin Peaks.

6 MR. KERN: I'd like to welcome everyone
7 to the meeting tonight, the Trust, Park Service,
8 Regulatory Community, our community members, and
9 any members of the public that are here. Thank you
10 for coming out. Any contractors for the Trust,
11 welcome here tonight. Does everyone have an
12 agenda? Are there any additions or changes to the
13 agenda? Seeing none, let's move on to Item No. 3.
14 That would be George and Craig.

15 MR. FORD: Okay. I actually have two
16 things to introduce here. One is -- let's start
17 off with the building. Welcome to Building 50.
18 This will be where we have the RAB meetings from
19 now on, in the foreseeable future. As you can see,
20 it's been nicely redone. I have a little personal
21 history with this building because I got married on
22 the Presidio in 1979, and we had our wedding
23 reception here, in fact, in this room and that
24 room. The roast beef was just about where Doug is
25 right now.

1 MR. KERN: I wish it was there right now.

2 MR. FORD: And so I have a lot of fond
3 memories of this building. Remember to tell your
4 friends, this is where we come for the meetings on
5 Tuesday night in the future. The building is
6 also available; if you would like to rent it for
7 something, you want to call Steve Overman at the
8 Presidio Trust, and he can set you up with whatever
9 we need. Having gotten the sales pitch out of the
10 way, I'd like to reintroduce Craig Cooper, who is a
11 new addition to the Trust Remediation staff, and he
12 will be the Remedial Program Manager taking over
13 the lion's share of Sharon's responsibilities.
14 Sharon is staying with the Trust and will be doing
15 more -- she'll be more in a liaison role within the
16 Trust. So you will still see her around, but Chris
17 and Craig and I will be faces that you see at most
18 of the RAB meetings and RAB committee meetings.
19 Craig will tell you a little bit about himself and
20 his history.

21 MR. COOPER: Okay. I know that we have a
22 lot to talk about tonight, so I'll try to be brief,
23 but I thought I'd give you at least a thumbnail
24 sketch of who I am and where I've been, and I look
25 forward to talking to you all more and working with

1 you all.

2 I'm a native Californian. I was born in
3 Modesto, and I went to UC Santa Barbara where I got
4 a degree in chemical engineering. After that, I
5 joined the Peace Corps, and upon coming back from
6 the Peace Corps, I got a job at the EPA, the
7 Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal EPA.
8 I first started out in the water division there,
9 working in construction grants on sewage treatment
10 plant systems, and in 1989, I transferred over to
11 the Superfund Program where I've been a Superfund
12 Project Manager ever since, until I started here
13 last week. I worked on Superfund sites in Arizona
14 and in Southern California, and the last Superfund
15 site I worked on for the last year and a half was
16 the Casmala (PHONETIC) Hazardous Waste landfill on
17 the Central Coast.

18 While working at UPA I went to University of
19 San Francisco, and I got a master's degree in
20 Environmental Management. And that's pretty much
21 my story. I look forward to working out in the
22 Presidio.

23 This is a great place. I think we've got a
24 great mandate before us to do some great work here,
25 and I look forward to getting to know all of you

1 and getting to understand all of your concerns and
2 your desires and looking forward to making some
3 progress. I have a stack of business cards here,
4 so maybe after the meeting we can talk some more.
5 That's it.

6 MR. KERN: Well, welcome to the Presidio
7 Craig, and I'm sure you're going to get lots of
8 input from all these folks. They're a bashful
9 group. We'll have to actually put a bag on this
10 guy, and just totally enclose him.

11 MR. BERMAN: Well, I will tell you that I
12 took a tranquilizer before I came here.

13 MR. ANDERSON: If Sharon has a different
14 role with respect to the group here -- is she still
15 co-chair, or will she be --

16 MR. FORD: Actually, the plan is that the
17 -- kind of official contact points that Sharon had,
18 RAB co-chair, and she's also the designated point
19 of contact for various regulatory entities, we'll
20 be swapping Craig's name in shortly. I think that
21 will happen next week.

22 MR. KERN: Committee reports.

23 MS. YOUNG: We had our Planning Committee
24 Meeting on the 23rd of October. We meet the fourth
25 Tuesday of every month at Building 1750 which is

1 the old Army Reserve Center down by Lobos Creek,
2 the engineering and maintenance facility, and we
3 had a good meeting. We had a good turnout. We
4 started out with an update on current activities
5 provided by George Ford from the Presidio Trust,
6 and he went through a variety of things that are
7 going on now, like the letter about the storm
8 drains, Sampling Plan, and other projects.

9 And then Julie Cheever, one of our members,
10 gave us a presentation on the newsletters that the
11 RAB has been contributing articles to for about the
12 last five years, something like that. We went
13 through the history of our newsletter involvement,
14 and we went over some of the upcoming articles that
15 will be in the newsletter. If anybody has ideas,
16 or would wish to write articles for the newsletter,
17 let Julie know.

18 We also ended up on a discussion on Landfill E.
19 We had a review of the October 22nd Stakeholder
20 Meeting and a pretty long discussion of the issues
21 and objectives surrounding that Sampling Plan that
22 will be coming up in December, I believe, the Draft
23 Sampling Plan. And our next meeting will be again
24 the fourth Tuesday of this month, December 27th, at
25 Building 1750. Bring some water or some change for

1 the soda machine. See you there. Thank you.

2 MR. KERN: Thanks Mark. Any questions for
3 Mark?

4 MR. SUTTER: As a new member, I had a
5 question of Julie as to the "newsletter." What is
6 it and what is the distribution of it? Where does
7 it go and so forth?

8 MS. CHEEVER: Well maybe this is partly a
9 question for Jane as well. Whatever Agency has
10 been cleaning up, formally the Army, and now the
11 Trust, puts out a periodic newsletter about the
12 cleanup. And about five years ago, we started
13 having a RAB article in it of different types,
14 maybe some of our own research on something like
15 Nike Missile Site or just a discussion of landfills
16 or updates on what the RAB has been doing. And
17 it's now going into something we appreciate, which
18 is kind-of a RAB page in what is now the Presidio
19 Trust Cleanup News. And a new one is soon to come
20 out. We can get it from Jane. But basically, we
21 say the Newsletter, but it's basically the Trust
22 Newsletter. We have one page where we write about
23 things from the RAB's point of view, but in a
24 fairly straightforward way. It's not editorials.
25 Jane, what about when the next one is coming out?

1 MS. PACKER: Actually, all the articles
2 we're working on (INAUDIBLE) as of today. So I
3 work with her on the set-up and everything, so it
4 should be within a week, most likely. Usually I
5 sent them to all RAB members. I have a mailing
6 list on my computer. You'll be receiving one in
7 the mail.

8 MR. SUTTER: Is it a monthly?

9 MS. PACKER: We're required by DTSC for a
10 quarterly report. This one will be in November.
11 We're trying to get it on a more accurate basis. I
12 think you had mentioned in the Committee Meeting
13 that you wanted to do two; is that right?

14 MS. CHEEVER: A year?

15 MS. PACKER: Right.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Well, you're required to do
17 four.

18 By the way, another thing you said, recently
19 the Trust went over the mail list, because there
20 are a lot of outdated names on it, but you welcome
21 suggestions for people to be on the mailing list.
22 So if anybody has suggestions of people from your
23 neighborhood, please forward them to Jane, because
24 you're trying to rebuild the list.

25 MS. PACKER: Yeah, I'm trying to rebuild

1 the list that the Army once had. Prior to my
2 coming here, the list was revamped, and we lost a
3 lot of people, so we're at a good number, but I'd
4 like to increase circulation.

5 MR. SUTTER: Does it go out to community
6 groups in San Francisco?

7 MS. PACKER: Mostly Presidio-based groups,
8 people who have concerns about what's going on
9 here, but I'd love to have ideas of different
10 community groups in the City that would be
11 interested in getting any thoughts or comments.

12 MR. SUTTER: I'll think about it.

13 MS. PACKER: Great.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Sam reminded me that at
15 the Committee Meeting, we also talked about the
16 ARARs for a little while, and we've tentatively
17 scheduled a meeting about the ARARs with Trust
18 people. But that has been postponed, so basically
19 it's postponed, the discussion, to a later
20 committee meeting that has not been rescheduled --

21 MR. KERN: Any other questions on the
22 committee reports? Let's move on them to Item No.
23 5, and Chris Nelson and the status update.

24 MR. NELSON: -- thank you, Doug. As is
25 customary for those new RAB members here this

Page 13

1 evening, or members of the public, you frequently
2 hear me talking about a variety of projects that
3 are going in the Presidio. I work mostly on
4 (INAUDIBLE) projects, and also (INAUDIBLE)
5 Presidio-wide projects. So without further ado.

6 The Presidio-wide Contingency Plan. The
7 status has not changed much since the last meeting
8 that we had in October. We have gotten some
9 changes that were necessary and incorporated into
10 the document, and the only thing that's pending at
11 this point is the ARARs which we are anticipating
12 receiving some comments from DTSC on soon, which we
13 will then incorporate and make any changes to the
14 document. I'm hoping we can get this document out
15 later this year (INAUDIBLE). However there are
16 some public meeting issues surrounding the release
17 of the documents, so we'll keep you posted on that.
18 We don't want to schedule a public meeting right
19 around the holidays.

20 Just a brief synopsis of what the Contingency
21 Plan is for those of you who don't know. For every
22 area of the Presidio that's designated either by
23 sites or by geography -- sometimes it's an
24 inoperable unit -- there will be a Cleanup Plan on
25 Remedial Action Plan to point out areas of

Page 14

1 contamination and levels of contamination and what
2 the appropriate remedy is. The Contingency Plan
3 covers areas in the Presidio that have not yet been
4 identified but are either suspected or we
5 anticipate that we'll find some unknown
6 contamination that was not pointed out by the Army.
7 This document will cover procedures, cleanup
8 methods to follow, notifications, et cetera, when
9 we find that contamination.

10 Moving on to the Main Installation Feasibility
11 Study under the CERCLA program. The greatest
12 amount of activity recently on the Feasibility
13 Study was the Field Investigations. In September,
14 we inserted soil gas probes around the Battery
15 Howe/Wagner site at Fort Scott, and they were in
16 the ground for approximately two weeks. We got the
17 results back in draft form, and they're being
18 reviewed and incorporated into a document at this
19 time. Unfortunately, there was no smoking gun to
20 indicate a source because that sort-of further
21 muddies the water, what could have caused this
22 contamination in the groundwater of that site. I'm
23 sure we'll be looking into it more carefully as the
24 report comes out.

25 On the additional data sites, we submitted a

Page 15

1 Sampling Plan which was approved by DTSC. Those of
2 you who don't recall, it was titled, "Field
3 Sampling Plan Addendum No. 4," and it covered the
4 five sites listed here on direction from DTSC this
5 year. We began a field effort last week, and did
6 some direct push investigations at Building 215 and
7 1244. We anticipate the work to be completed by
8 Thursday of this week and doing some step-out
9 samplings of areas and also some hand auger
10 (PHONETIC) borings in some of the more shallow
11 locations that are difficult to access. Once
12 these analytical results are in, and we have them
13 analyzed and interpreted, we'll have a report out
14 for review.

15 MR. BERMAN: A question. On the carbon
16 tet, has the source area been identified?

17 MR. NELSON: Well, as a result of the low
18 levels -- I think there were 15 sample locations
19 and there were only 12 hits, so any BFC altogether
20 (INAUDIBLE) I can't remember if there were multiple
21 hits in one location, but they were all very, very
22 low. And that speaks further to what I said about
23 there not being a smoking gun. There was no area
24 that was exceptionally high or even high in carbon
25 tetrachloride to indicate that there may have been

Page 16

1 a spill or there may have been a hot spot in the
2 groundwater (INAUDIBLE) soil gas. So I think from
3 the standpoint of searching for the source, it
4 would have been more fortunate to have found
5 something like that because it would make it a lot
6 easier to address the problem. At this time,
7 without definitive information from this data, it's
8 hard to say where the source is coming from,
9 whether it's upgradient or -- We know from looking
10 at the groundwater that the highest concentrations
11 have been detected upgradient, so it indicates an
12 upgradient source in the soil at some point.
13 However, the soil gas does not support that at that
14 time.

15 MR. BERMAN: But you think you've gone far
16 enough upgradient to get beyond where the
17 suspicious stuff -- even though there's not a
18 smoking gun --presumably you've taken some samples
19 far enough upgradient so you can be assured that
20 you've gone beyond where the guess is.

21 MR. NELSON: I'm using conventional
22 methods of investigating the sources. I think so,
23 yes. It's possible that there was some spill or
24 some activity that was never reported, and that is
25 what caused the contamination. But just look at

1 their historical records and evaluating past uses
 2 of buildings and looking at aerial photographs and
 3 looking at things like that, we took our best shot
 4 at evaluating areas where there were buildings that
 5 once had any type of chemical use associated with
 6 it, whether it was storage, cleaning, dry cleaners,
 7 things like that, gas stations. That was the sort
 8 of thing we were looking for. We placed the
 9 samples, the soil gas probes, in those areas,
 10 hoping if there had been some intensive use that
 11 perhaps a spill would capture that. But it did
 12 not.

13 MR. BERMAN: Is there any possibility that
 14 it could have been a source within the carbontet
 15 that was not being picked on this soil gas
 16 contaminations? Is there some chemistry or some
 17 possibility that something would show up in the
 18 groundwater that would not show up in soil gas?

19 MR. NELSON: I'm not a chemist, so I
 20 wouldn't be able to speak definitely to that, but
 21 what I could say is, what's been found in the past
 22 in surveys like this is that if enough time goes
 23 by, the chemical essentially dissipates in the soil
 24 and the majority of the contamination is in the
 25 groundwater. And so what we're finding is a source

1 that is no longer definitive, and the most likely
 2 place to find it is in its resting place, which is
 3 the groundwater. I think Craig or Brian have a
 4 little bit more chemistry background.

5 MR. FORD: Usually, carbontets are fairly
 6 volatile solvents, and so it's normally pretty good
 7 for tracking volatiles. It's one of the best
 8 techniques (INAUDIBLE). But you have to look at a
 9 wide area to try to -- You don't know where the
 10 source is, and you're trying to find it by sampling
 11 a lot of different volatiles. Soil gas works
 12 really well for finding volatiles.

13 MR. BERMAN: Right. Unless the source is
 14 really upstream, much further than you suspect.
 15 And so they did not -- you're pecking in an area
 16 where there's a minimal amount of soil gas just
 17 from the transfer from the groundwater, but the
 18 real source is way upgradient.

19 MR. FORD: Yeah, I guess we've got to look
 20 at the data that brings it out, (INAUDIBLE) beneath
 21 the battery or something else. I remember looking
 22 at Exploration Plan. It covered a pretty wide
 23 area. It sure seems like if there was a source in
 24 the neighborhood it likely would have fallen inside
 25 the soil gas (INAUDIBLE). We'll have to look at it

1 and figure it out. If it is possible that it's
 2 even farther upgradient, we should be able to
 3 figure out that possibility. If that turns out to
 4 be the case, then maybe we can go back for another
 5 route. I'd be surprised if that ends up being the
 6 case. I guess we'll see once we get all the data.

7 MR. BOGGS: Does the Field Study include
 8 repeated sampling of the groundwater that showing
 9 the carbon tetrachloride?

10 MR. NELSON: Well, the groundwater
 11 monitoring program that's currently underway will
 12 capture and monitor groundwater and (INAUDIBLE).

13 MR. BOGGS: Have there been any samples
 14 that confirm that anything is still there?

15 MR. NELSON: It's consistently shown up in
 16 the groundwater, carbon tetrachloride, yes. Is
 17 that what you're asking?

18 MR. BOGGS: Yes.

19 MR. NELSON: There wasn't any plan in
 20 place to go after no-hits. I guess there was more
 21 a plan in place to go after hits. And we found
 22 this smoking gun, (INAUDIBLE) terminology that I
 23 use. We were hoping that would help us use more
 24 direct methods than saying, "It's really hot here.
 25 Let me take a soil sample and see." And that would

1 sometimes lead to that area that you suspect is the
 2 worst.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (INAUDIBLE)

4 MR. NELSON: I believe May and August.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So are those wells
 6 consistent with the history? Are they historical,
 7 or are they showing increases or --

8 MR. NELSON: I don't recall what the
 9 results were. I think they were comparable.

10 MR. FORD: I have not seen August either.
 11 I think the manual is also fairly comparable.

12 MR. COOPER: It's a good point, though.
 13 We used to see a trend in groundwater
 14 concentrations, and groundwater concentrations are
 15 going up, (INAUDIBLE) but if groundwater
 16 concentrations remain the same or going down, that
 17 means the source could be dissipated out of the
 18 soils (INAUDIBLE).

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think one thing is that
 20 there is one well downgradient from Battery, away
 21 from where the suspected source area might
 22 (INAUDIBLE) this has been pointed out as the
 23 highest level of upgradient. One downgradient
 24 (INAUDIBLE) early in their study process. It's
 25 been fairly consistent in the level of carbontet

1 for years. So prior to the work of Trust, we had
 2 what appeared to be a fairly steady situation out
 3 there. So I think you could look at one well --
 4 often won't move around as much if the other one's
 5 stable, or if it does, it starts to show
 6 (INAUDIBLE) pools. We kind of pick that up. I
 7 think Sam, one thing you were talking about is
 8 trying to see if transport groundwater would
 9 necessarily reflect in the soil gas. There was a
 10 soil gas sample collected near the well tide. That
 11 came up negative, and that was a (INAUDIBLE)
 12 hypothesis, that maybe it's transported without
 13 volatilizing. And so once the data gets to a
 14 reviewable form, we can go and explore that
 15 question in detail.

16 MR. NELSON: Any more questions on that?
 17 Thank you.

18 On the Feasibility Study Report itself, our
 19 consultant Erle & Cowanowski is revising the
 20 document. We were a little bit sidelined in the
 21 last few weeks getting the Field Sampling Plan out
 22 and getting out in the field. So we're working on
 23 getting the Trust and Park Service another review
 24 version that we hope to get out to the public in
 25 December.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Chris, are the ARARs part of
 2 the Feasibility Study?

3 MR. NELSON: Yeah. The ARARs was
 4 technically -- it's a portion of the Feasibility
 5 Study that's required to be included as part of the
 6 guidance document for the EPA. The traditional
 7 process was to include the ARARs. And what we did
 8 was -- We were hoping to get an early analysis and
 9 input on the ARARs for a variety of documents that
 10 we're sort of relying on, including George's Fill
 11 Site 5/Landfill 4 Remedial Action Plan, and also
 12 the Contingency Plan, which I mentioned earlier.
 13 So if the ARARs issue is not resolved, I think we
 14 are probably close enough on track now that we can
 15 release the Feasibility Study with the revised
 16 ARARs section in it. Otherwise if we weren't able
 17 to do that, we could have just issued the document
 18 for the same section and then if we got the
 19 comments on the ARARs we could just issue it again
 20 because it was sort of tracking separately. And
 21 that takes us to our next point.

22 MS. CHEEVER: We should probably say what
 23 ARARs are.

24 MR. NELSON: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. ARARs
 25 are applicable or relevant and appropriate

1 requirements, which are essentially laws and
 2 regulations that govern environmental protection
 3 and the cleanup process. And CERCLA, the law, says
 4 that you must look at how the cleanup of your site
 5 is going to impact the environment, whether it be
 6 transportation of hazardous materials through a
 7 neighborhood or how you store hazardous wastes when
 8 you're excavating it, or whether or not you have to
 9 wash down a truck and where that washwater goes
 10 before it leaves the site. And there's a variety
 11 of different things, protection of endangered
 12 species, and the like. The wetlands. And there
 13 was a fairly extensive analysis of ARARs that was
 14 done I believe, released to the public (INAUDIBLE)
 15 RAB Agency in August for review. Actually, I
 16 haven't talked to Bob this evening, but we should
 17 be getting comments before Thanksgiving next week.
 18 So DTSC will be weighing in, and we'll be able to
 19 provide some important --

20 MR. O'HARA: Chris, once you get the
 21 comments, what's the next step?

22 MR. NELSON: The comments from the DTSC?

23 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

24 MR. NELSON: It's to revise that section
 25 and make sure that we are complying with their

1 wishes and that (INAUDIBLE). Typical of any other
 2 responsive comment process that we go through. We
 3 make sure we incorporate Bobs' comments, and that
 4 the ARARs section is acceptable to DTSC.

5 MR. O'HARA: Is that then subject to
 6 public comments?

7 MR. NELSON: Yeah. The RAB has the
 8 opportunity to provide comments as well, although I
 9 know one of the things about ARARs is that it has
 10 been sort of a difficult thing to get your arms
 11 around. I know that we've said repeatedly we're
 12 going to have a meeting, and I'm still planning to
 13 do that. I think after having DTSC's comments, we
 14 can look at them and digest them a little bit, and
 15 then we can come together on what some of the
 16 concerns are. One of the desires on the part of
 17 the RAB, and was something that we had talked about
 18 in the past, was to have our attorney and/or
 19 attorneys present at the meeting. So we need to
 20 explore that possibility and see what's amenable to
 21 them.

22 MR. FORD: I think we're planning to do
 23 that, but we need to get a little closer to the end
 24 product, so that we actually have something
 25 meaningful to discuss at that meeting, rather than

1 a document that may still be subject to a lot of
2 revision.

3 MR. NELSON: I think based on comments
4 that I've heard from Bob and perhaps even RAB, that
5 hopefully with these revisions we'll make the
6 section a lot more clear and perhaps a little bit
7 more detailed rather than just having a table of
8 ARARs mentioning a site, what the proposed remedy
9 is from the study and what ARARs apply. Those
10 ARARs would be described in such a way that you
11 would see how that particular regulation, law,
12 statute or whatever, applied to that remedy. It
13 might make it a little bit clearer.

14 MR. PONTON: The Water Board will be
15 making some comments.

16 MR. NELSON: You are. Okay. Will that be
17 coming next?

18 MR. PONTON: Probably not.

19 MR. NELSON: Well, that may have an impact
20 on the final release of the ARARs we'll be making
21 then as we release the -- I was thinking out loud
22 here -- as is without the revised version and take
23 a look at the Water Board comments and incorporate
24 those comments as well. So I want to thank
25 everybody for their patience and hanging in there

1 with the ARARs process. I know it was a long one.
2 But we're going to get through it with all of your
3 appropriate input and comments as we do with
4 everything else.

5 Are there any more questions on ARARs? No.

6 Cleanup Level Document. If you recall, there
7 was a Cleanup Level Document that was put out. It
8 was sort of a companion volume to the Feasibility
9 Study, establishing cleanup levels for soils,
10 sediments, surface water, ground water at the
11 Presidio. And I've spoken with Bob and have his
12 comments in my hand right here. We just received
13 them tonight. So we'll take a look at them, and
14 issue them to the consultant and possibly talk to
15 DTSC if there are any questions so we can be sure
16 we incorporate all their comments. And then once
17 we do that, we can issue the document as final, and
18 any of the cleanups that we do from here on out not
19 related to petroleum but to the CERCLA program,
20 we'll be relying on that Cleanup Level document.

21 MR. BERMAN: Chris, do you expect any
22 comment from EPA on the Cleanup Level document?

23 MR. NELSON: You know, we did issue the
24 document to them for their comments. And I recall,
25 we did have a meeting last year where EPA attended.

1 It's been a sufficient amount of time when we have
2 not heard anything from them. We could solicit
3 comments, but I'm not sure we're going to get them
4 at this point. I think enough time has elapsed
5 that we would have gotten them.

6 MR. BERMAN: Were they sort of delegated
7 (INAUDIBLE) DTSC to be the spokesperson?

8 MR. NELSON: Well, they've sort of done
9 that all together on this process, yeah. I think
10 they like to keep an eye on what was going on to
11 make sure that the process didn't go sideways and
12 that the State was comfortable with what was going
13 on. I think that after the meeting last year and
14 the subsequent meetings on the background metals
15 and such, they must-- and I can't speak for them --
16 there may have been a greater level of comfort that
17 they had. But I recall something that Ned Black
18 had said at that meeting, and that was to have us
19 propose something and have that weigh on it,
20 whether or not we were way off the mark or on
21 track. His essential feedback last year was,
22 "You're on the right track. Give us what you have,
23 and we can comment it." We haven't received any
24 comments.

25 MR. SUTTER: Chris, is there a statutory

1 time limit that EPA has to abide by as far as
2 responding with comments?

3 MR. NELSON: Well, we're not under any
4 type of agreement with EPA, whereas we are with the
5 State agencies. It's not to say that we wouldn't
6 honor any comments we would receive from them or in
7 a public discussion with them. But we don't fund
8 the oversight of EPA for this cleanup. And so I
9 think, to my knowledge, we've only received
10 comments from them on one or two documents in the
11 last two and a half years. Not much.

12 MR. SUTTER: My only question is, do we
13 have to worry about closure with them if we go
14 ahead, and then we hear from them a couple of
15 months later for comment. What does that mean for
16 us?

17 MR. NELSON: I think Bob or Craig would
18 probably speak to the role that EPA and DTSC would
19 play together in such a case. I think the agencies
20 would have to be in disagreement for one of them to
21 usurp the other's decision.

22 MR. COOPER: My understanding is this is a
23 State site, and EPA is basically delegated. We
24 don't plan on intervening or anything, unless
25 asked. Yes. EPA, like Craig says, has an

1 oversight to make sure we're not going too far out
2 of bounds or anything like that. I have made a
3 note to myself to check with Michael Work
4 (PHONETIC). He's the Fed EPA person in charge,
5 just to make sure, so that in case his people --
6 Ned Black is the risk assessor over there -- in
7 case he finds something that our risk assessor
8 missed that's a big smoking gun, but I doubt it.
9 They've worked together. That's why they feel
10 confident in our risk assessors, that sort of
11 thing. So I think as a matter of courtesy, we
12 should just follow up with them to see if they are
13 going to submit comments, but in general, they
14 haven't been.

15 As far as the statutory limit, there
16 can be a statutory limit, but it's easily
17 circumvented by the regulatory agencies. So it's
18 better just to work with us.

19 MR. SUTTER: I'm not trying to create any
20 kind of issue here. I'm just asking a question.
21 That's all. In my career in the past, I've been
22 bit in the butt by one agency coming in after one
23 thought that they had already accepted it. I'm
24 just asking a question.

25 MR. FORD: It's a good point.

1 Our success in that remains to be seen. Anyway,
2 we're currently preparing a scope of work, and that
3 scope of work will direct our consultant to prepare
4 a Field Sampling Plan. Part of that Scope of Work
5 will also include meetings with stakeholders to
6 discuss the strategy of the Sampling Plan to make
7 sure that we're meeting the stakeholders' concerns.
8 We've taken a first step forward with that, and we
9 feel that we're on the right track based on some
10 feedback that we've gotten. So I anticipate being
11 able to release the scope of work to the
12 contractors within the next couple of weeks, and we
13 should get a proposal from them.

14 On the Field Sampling Plan, probably the early
15 part of next year. We've been sidelined by the
16 latest field network we're on, and trying to get
17 back on track with that. The Trust is committed to
18 continuing with this process and getting
19 investigation going. And we appreciate all the
20 comments that we've received from the stakeholders
21 at the last meeting, and we'll be sure to keep you
22 in the loop on the progress.

23 MR. FORD: If I could jump in for a
24 second. There's one thing that I promised to put
25 together at the last meeting that's not come out

1 MR. COOPER: I'm so new to it, I mean, if
2 it's okay with Bob, I'll double-check with the EPA
3 representatives and make sure they're not going to
4 be commenting on this document or subsequent
5 documents, or where is their interest, if any.
6 It's my understanding that there isn't any.

7 MR. BERMAN: Well, I think that they did
8 make a few interesting comments about the quality
9 of some lab work in the past. I think that's been
10 quite useful, but it was more or less informal
11 comments. But I don't think there's ever been any
12 formal document coming from EPA on the cleanup.

13 MR. BOGGS: Not in recent years.

14 MR. NELSON: Any more comments or
15 questions on the cleanup level document?

16 Okay. Last couple of items. Landfill E, which
17 came up at the last RAB meeting. Mark mentioned it
18 was discussed at the RAB Committee Meeting in
19 October. Based on a request from DTSC and repeated
20 discussions with the RAB about Landfill E, the
21 Trust is going to initiate an investigation. We're
22 hoping to kill a few birds with one stone. In
23 other words, we're calling this the last hurrah in
24 terms of investigations, fulfilling both additional
25 characterization and also remedial design criteria.

1 yet. You talked about a list of objectives that we
2 would circulate so that all the various parties
3 could look at the list and see whether their
4 objectives were on there, and if not, bring it up.
5 I have to get on that, and it will be coming out
6 momentarily. We will be sending that around as
7 part of the Planning Documentation for getting this
8 investigation rolling.

9 MR. BERMAN: Presumably you need the
10 objectives, at least in your mind, in order to
11 develop a Sampling Plan request from the
12 contractor.

13 MR. NELSON: That's sort of what we did at
14 the meeting on the 22nd, was to sort of get some
15 ideas and get some discussions going, opening up.
16 We had a consultant there, business subcontractor
17 for EKI, and Holder Associates presented last
18 December on Landfill E. They were discussing the
19 merits of the capping, and what the difference
20 layers of the cap would entail, and also they
21 discussed what sort of data gaps they'd be looking
22 for. And frankly they felt they needed to take a
23 closer look at the data that was there to determine
24 what was really necessary. The State has discussed
25 a need, some geotechnical information about the

1 stability of the site, both within the center of
2 the site as well as at Snoope (PHONETIC) Slope, to
3 the north there.

4 There's also been some concern about landfill
5 gas. How much landfill gas is being generated at
6 the sites? We intend to look at that. There is
7 also the idea of putting in some areas that has not
8 been sampled for chemical analysis. There have
9 been some areas of the site where they had been
10 characterized. We tested bits and logs but no
11 chemical analysis. It might allow us to refine our
12 estimate of the content of hazardous percentages
13 with some additional soil samples. Those are some
14 of the things that we talked about and got some
15 feedback on that. So I think we're heading down
16 the right track. Doug, you can add anything that
17 you'd like.

18 MR. KERN: Well, it's been a long haul to
19 get to this point. I'm really pleased that we're
20 going to be able to develop kind-of a consensus
21 plan around looking at Landfill E, not just with
22 one alternative in mind, but perhaps multiple
23 alternatives. The multiple alternatives have to do
24 with capping versus excavation, and perhaps
25 something in between. So objectives are going to

1 need to include those kinds of things. We like to
2 understand where the previous creek system was, so
3 that if people are able to move down the road
4 towards restoration at some point, there could be
5 some understanding through that investigation. So
6 I'm looking forward to this whole process around
7 Landfill E. I hope we take our time with it and
8 put a lot of effort into it.

9 MS. CHEEVER: You said you were hoping to
10 accomplish a couple of things, both Conditional
11 Characterization Field Sampling and also Remedial
12 Design Criteria. I'm not quite sure how this
13 Conditional Remedial Design Criteria fits in with
14 the selection of the remedy. Does that mean a
15 certain part will be exhumed, or what?

16 MR. NELSON: Well, at this time, the
17 remedies that have been proposed in the Feasibility
18 Study include excavation and capping with a
19 river-style cap. Engineering Commerce is going to
20 be planning a gas collection, groundwater/surface
21 water diversion, et cetera. So based on some input
22 that we've received, if that remedy were to be
23 accepted, that proposal were to be accepted, the
24 State wants to feel a little more comfortable about
25 some of those issues that I mentioned or capping

1 the site. That includes the stability issue and
2 the landfill gas issue. This investigation would
3 answer some of those questions for us, and get us
4 closer to designing that cap, if that is indeed
5 what is to happen. But the Feasibility Study
6 process isn't done, and there's no final decision
7 on a remedy. It's just at this time, we might have
8 to (INAUDIBLE) and that's what we're proposing. It
9 ain't over until it's over, I guess, is the moral
10 of the story.

11 I'd like to wrap up my section so I can leave
12 it for George. My last item is the Public Health
13 Service Hospital Landfills. Based on a request by
14 DTSC, we're conducting an additional
15 characterization investigation and a five-year
16 review of the remedies at the two sites, Public
17 Health Service Hospital Landfills 8 and 10. We
18 received a Work Plan from some consultants in
19 October, and Brian and I reviewed them. We got the
20 comments back, and we're still working out some
21 details on getting the comments responded to
22 appropriately, and when we have a document that we
23 can release, we will. And based on those comments
24 getting incorporated by the stakeholders, we'd like
25 to get in the field next year, or earlier

1 preferably, and do some additional investigations,
2 and complete this five-year review and evaluate the
3 remedies.

4 MR. KERN: I guess about this time last
5 year, we were as committees and sub-committees
6 talking about different sites and different areas.
7 This particular set, 8 and 10, were coming up about
8 that time. So I'm kind of curious about the sense
9 of what kind of investigation is being considered,
10 and whether you might be considering the kinds of
11 things that we were talking about this time last
12 year in the investigation.

13 MR. NELSON: Do you feel comfortable me
14 mentioning what those objectives are? I just want
15 to make sure we're all working from the same sheet
16 of music.

17 The investigation objectives -- We're hoping to
18 find out what is the situation with the seismic
19 stability, geotechnical stability, of Landfill 10.
20 With some plan or desired site changes in the
21 future, primarily implementing some Vegetation
22 Management Plan programs, including extending the
23 habitat of the San Francisco Lasinga (PHONETIC), we
24 are evaluating if sort of a seismically-stable
25 slope would be optimal at Landfill 10. So we'll be

1 collecting some soil samples to determine the
2 engineering properties of soils. And then
3 evaluating, based on the contents of the landfill
4 and the amount of concrete and other debris that's
5 in it, what needs to be done in order to make that
6 slope stable, and also to support vegetation that's
7 planned for that area.

8 A second additional bonus to that would be also
9 that if we had a stable slope, it would be a
10 protected creek resource down-gradient. So there's
11 a protection factor there that's rolled into that.
12 As a result, we would envision some changes to the
13 parking lot, perhaps elimination of a portion of it
14 as we soften that (INAUDIBLE) to allow for some
15 restoration work. We'd have to eliminate some mass
16 there, and probably do a significant amount of
17 regrading to drain the stormwater in the
18 appropriate direction away from the creek.

19 As far as Landfill 8 goes, there is a desire to
20 try and determine more definitively the volume.
21 There's been a question for years whether or not
22 those wings, as we've come to call them, are
23 actually hazardous materials in soil, or whether
24 they're just fill soil or even new soil that was
25 pushed around for grading purposes. So they're

1 being looked at, those soils on the wings. And
2 then also there were some areas around the presumed
3 perimeter of the landfill that the Army had to find
4 that needs some additional testing. So we're doing
5 some testing there. And then also some test pits
6 from the middle. So we will get a pretty good
7 idea, based on the same methodology that was used
8 in the Feasibility Study of EPI to estimate the
9 volume, and also be able to figure out how much
10 soil, how much debris, how much hazardous waste, et
11 cetera.

12 The Five-Year Review itself, we'll be looking
13 at the performance of the remedies, and after five
14 years, has the groundwater actually shown any
15 impacts, or is it tended to stabilize, (INAUDIBLE)
16 et cetera, and that sort of thing.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Previously, didn't the Army
18 have a record of a decision that about two years
19 ago the Trust was talking about reopening that? Is
20 the Five-Year Review a review of the Army's
21 recommended decision?

22 MR. NELSON: Yes, it is.

23 MS. CHEEVER: So now you're not using the
24 language of saying reopening that. But is that
25 something that is still on the table, following

1 this look at what the investigation produces, or --

2 MR. NELSON: I think we need to evaluate
3 that possibility, and we need to see what the
4 outcome of the investigations are, and we need to
5 see where the State is (INAUDIBLE) stakeholders.
6 We received some direction that a ROD was not
7 necessary, but a five-year review may answer that
8 question more definitively than just a letter from
9 the Agency. So that's kind of a long yes, I guess.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Was that direction then from
11 DTSC?

12 MR. NELSON: Yes.

13 MR. BOGGS: It's actually a regulatory
14 requirement that they do that after five years,
15 recommending a remedy. It's just a check to make
16 sure the remedy's working and that sort of thing.
17 There's different levels of those reviews. They're
18 kind of doing between the first and second tier of
19 the Five-Year Review.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Does that have the same
21 result as possibly reopening the decision, or is it
22 a less definite step than what we were talking
23 about a year or two ago?

24 MR. BOGGS: Well, a year or two ago, they
25 were talking about opening the ROD. And DTSC

1 wasn't too favorable of that; i.e, for us to go
2 back and change a legal decision in our department,
3 we have to see something significant that the
4 remedies changed. So far, we haven't seen that the
5 remedy really needs to change. But, like you said,
6 this Five-Year Review will hopefully tell us that
7 something needs to change without the remedy or it
8 won't, and then if something needs to change, yes,
9 we'll go change the ROD and put in the remedy. And
10 if not, we just keep moving forward, and then in
11 another five years, we'll check again to make sure
12 the remedy is still working.

13 MR. NELSON: Thanks for that input, Bob.
14 If there are no more questions for me, I'd like to
15 hand the floor over to George Ford.

16 MR. FORD: Okay. I'll just start going
17 through the slides here, and stop me if you have
18 any questions.

19 On the Master Schedule, we sent in a draft
20 submittal to DTSC on the second of October. We met
21 and discussed it on the 16th, and we expect the
22 schedule will probably also be a major topic of
23 discussion at the bimonthly meeting, which is
24 happening next Tuesday, a week from today in the
25 daytime. I think it starts at 10:00, at Building

1 1750.

2 The Master Schedule, I think, should be
3 considered a work in progress. We're moving the
4 big pieces around to accommodate the needs of both
5 the Trust and the Park Service, and I expect as we
6 go through the scheduling process, we'll be finding
7 that other people have requirements that we need to
8 accommodate on our schedule. So we're working on
9 that. If you have strong opinions about it, you
10 might want to come next Tuesday morning. Next
11 slide please.

12 Okay. Groundwater Monitoring Program. I'm not
13 sure this slide got updated. Well, I guess part of
14 it did, but part of it didn't. The 2nd quarter
15 Revised Draft Sampling Report actually came back
16 from the Park Service on the 23rd of October. So
17 the Trust sent it back to the consultant, who I
18 believe is now wrestling with it and trying to get
19 it into final format so that it can be released for
20 everybody to review.

21 Table 1, which is the means by which we -- sort
22 of a simple table that includes anything that we're
23 proposing to change for the next round of
24 groundwater sampling. It's supposed to come out
25 this week. So you should be seeing it momentarily.

1 The next round of sampling begins two weeks
2 from yesterday. The groundwater is moving along
3 slowly. We're still getting these first few
4 reports, quarterly reports out. It's been like
5 pulling teeth. We hope that as the consultant and
6 the Trust and the Park Service all get on the same
7 page that we will be able to turn them out a little
8 more quickly in the future. I think the
9 information is more relevant -- You know, the
10 sooner you can get it, the better off it is. We
11 recognize that it's taken a long time. We need to
12 get these things going. We hope that we'll be able
13 to produce them more quickly in the future.

14 MR. BERMAN: Is there any suggestion that
15 you need to dig more wells?

16 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I
17 don't think -- I mean, we have specific sites where
18 we know we have wells that we want to remove or
19 replace or add to, but I don't really think there's
20 a global evaluation for --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. The interpretation
22 and presentation data don't go into such detail,
23 but it's set up so that someone could then do that
24 sort of analysis.

25 MR. BERMAN: Right. But my question

1 really is, is there a suggestion from looking at
2 that data that new wells are needed, or is it too
3 early at this time?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know that
5 anyone's done that. I know when the report comes
6 out, we can all review that. In my review, nothing
7 jumps out as obvious. I don't recall that there
8 was anything that was significantly different on a
9 (INAUDIBLE) basis, per site in the past. Or if
10 there were, those were differences that were
11 already being addressed.

12 MR. BERMAN: Just on an informational
13 level, is there a Presidio-wide map with all the
14 wells marked on it that will be available for us to
15 look at?

16 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I
17 don't think I've seen a single one that has all the
18 wells.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I have seen one. I'm not
20 sure if it's in the report though.

21 MR. NELSON: If you could get your hands
22 on the Army's monitoring plan -- no?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not the Army's plan.

24 MR. FORD: We'll get you one of those. It
25 seems like that's a tool that we ought to have.

1 We'll get something put together.

2 MR. BERMAN: It would be kind-of useful to
3 look at when you're talking about the report, in
4 advance --

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's fairly large.

6 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the things that we
8 did to improve them, one is, compared to this
9 report that's coming out compared to what the Army
10 did, there are area interpretations and
11 preservations, so that adjacent sites were shown on
12 the same (INAUDIBLE), whereas the Army had them on
13 separate maps. And here you could begin to see how
14 sites may -- as you look -- the sites don't
15 (INAUDIBLE) probably water does seem to flow
16 between certain sites. And when you look at whole
17 areas of the Presidio and see if it bends
18 essentially in terms of (INAUDIBLE), and that does
19 change interpretations compared to where you can
20 (INAUDIBLE). So in that regard, it does
21 significantly help to look at the area, with a
22 chance to see all of them, looking up from another
23 part of it and see all those sites at once.

24 MR. O'HARA: Do you have any idea when the
25 report will be coming out?

1 MR. FORD: No, I don't. I can find out
2 and call you. Jan Coates is handling that, and I
3 neglected to ask her this afternoon, but I'll find
4 out and let you know. Other questions about
5 groundwater? If you think of something as we go
6 along, we can come back to it.

7 LAIR. For those of you who don't love it as
8 much as I do, LAIR stands for Letterman Army
9 Institute of Research, which a month ago I knew
10 very little about, and now I know a little bit more
11 about it.

12 As you may recall, last month we discussed this
13 at the RAB, and you collectively showed some
14 interest in making sure that there were no
15 surprises that would come from a demolition of
16 LAIR. We heard you. And so we've been digging
17 into it, metaphorically speaking, since then. We
18 have not been digging into it literally. The
19 structure of the LAIR is essentially gone. I think
20 there is a portion of what used to be the library
21 left standing. They're in the process of bringing
22 that down. What they have done is bring the
23 building down into the basement. Those are now
24 filled up with the blackened rubble from the
25 portion that was above-ground. And the contractor

1 will shortly begin removing the blown rubble from
2 the basement shoveling it out, and then at some
3 point later this months or in early December they
4 will get to the point where they need to look at
5 removing the basement walls and the basement
6 floors. What the Trust has committed to do is get
7 -- we've tried to put together an Investigation
8 Plan that covers possible contingencies as far as
9 leaks from the sanitary sewage that are below the
10 basement floor. And actually I only brought 20
11 copies, and I have no explanation why I only
12 brought 20. Anybody who is interested is welcome
13 to take a copy of this Investigation Plan. This is
14 something that the Trust put together. We sent it
15 to DTSC and they're reviewing it. Bob and I have
16 had some discussions, and Bob's been out to the
17 site. Basically it consists of two things: There
18 is a proposed Sampling and Analysis Program.
19 Basically what the Trust is proposing to do is to
20 inspect the sewage trenches as the sewages are
21 being removed for any signs of leakage. We think
22 that because they are sanitary sewers, if they did
23 leak, we'll be able to see it. I can vouch for the
24 fact, having looked at a lot of other sanitary
25 sewers, we dig up in the course of our business

1 when sanitary sewers look -- Normally, there's
2 visual evidence. But you could get some signs of
3 staining in the soil. What we're proposing to do
4 is to observe as the sanitary sewers are removed,
5 and any place that we observe any visible evidence
6 of contamination, we cover it right back up.

7 Knowing DTSC and other regulatory agencies, I
8 think there's probably a reasonable chance that
9 DTSC will actually be on site while this work is
10 being done. So the notification may consist of my
11 looking at that. Once we identify something, we
12 might uncover a backup. And then maybe (INAUDIBLE)
13 to sample it through the cover, whether the cover
14 is plastic or soiled.

15 We conduct our operation such that we'd be able
16 to immediately recover anything that is exposed.
17 The soil samples would then be analyzed for a list
18 of analytes that we have proposed that's also
19 described in this document, plus anything else that
20 the Army advises us that we should analyze for.

21 And the second part of this document is that
22 we sent a letter to the Army, also in late October,
23 asking their assistance. We asked them to review
24 the analyte list that we proposed, which is
25 basically a fairly complete suite of organic and

1 inorganic chemicals. We've asked them to review
2 this list and advise us either that it is
3 appropriate to detect anything that may have been
4 used at LAIR, or if it is not sufficient to detect
5 anything they used at LAIR, to advise us what
6 should be added. And what we've also asked is if
7 there's anything that we should test for at LAIR,
8 that for which tests are not commercially available
9 at commercial labs, that they would advise us about
10 that and also assist us.

11 We've been in contact with the Army since we
12 sent this request for help, and I know we haven't
13 received a response from them yet. I have been
14 told that they will respond.

15 One of our concerns was the Army is fighting a
16 war right now, and this kind of a request, while
17 it's very important to all of us who are here, it
18 may not be a Priority One item in Washington, D.C.

19 But we do have some movement. We know that
20 people in the Pentagon are discussing this, and
21 they have made it clear that they would respond to
22 us. We don't have a date for -- a date certain by
23 which they will respond, but we are pressing them
24 and explaining to them the urgency of getting their
25 input on this issue before it comes time to do the

1 basement excavation.

2 MR. SUTTER: A timeframe is included in
3 all this?

4 MR. FORD: We haven't asked them
5 specifically. If you look at this, it's more of a
6 request.

7 MR. SUTTER: I was just making an aside.

8 MR. FORD: There's actually an interesting
9 article about New York, about the Anthrax strain.
10 Of course, now everyone's interested in this, and
11 the people who found it in Iowa, about a month ago,
12 destroyed all of their remaining samples. This is
13 unbelievable, just as this becomes a huge issue to
14 millions of people. They cooked all the bugs and
15 killed them all. They didn't ask me.

16 MR. O'HARA: Would you undertake any kind
17 of testing or start to remove soil over the sewer
18 line prior to the time the Army responds to you?

19 MR. FORD: No. We're going to get a
20 response from the Army. We're also doing our own
21 research into what kinds of tests are available,
22 and what it would make sense to do. What we're
23 trying to do is proceed on two fronts. We are
24 asking the Army, "Is there anything that we should
25 be concerned about here? And if there is, please

1 advise us how we should handle it." But we're also
2 doing our own research to try to make sure we
3 understand -- If we find the Army's answer less
4 than completely satisfactory, we want to have our
5 own Contingency Plan. Essentially we want to have
6 our own program in mind.

7 MR. O'HARA: Do your resources include
8 people who are technically qualified to give you
9 advice on biohazards?

10 MR. FORD: At this point, I would say no,
11 but we're just getting into that part of it. So by
12 the time we get to the point where we're exposing
13 any soil, we will have collected that advice.

14 I should point out in my research about the
15 history of LAIR, the Army has consistently denied
16 that they used or that they did any biological
17 weapons research there. And I think their denials
18 are consistent with the history of US policy in
19 that area. So the Army's official position in the
20 past has been that they didn't do any chemical
21 warfare research, and they didn't do any biological
22 warfare agent research there, and when they
23 decommissioned the buildings in '93 and '94, that
24 they followed all the protocols for decommissioning
25 a hospital building that were then in force. And

1 to the extent that I can tell from my research,
2 they did have a radionuclide issue there, and they
3 did have to do a fair amount of cleanup in some of
4 their laboratories, including taking furniture out
5 and cleaning walls and removing some surfaces.

6 Essentially the Army acknowledged that they
7 used radioactive materials there. They did a
8 screening for it. They found some inside the
9 building, and they went through a removal process,
10 and they actually commissioned a division of the
11 Oakridge Research Laboratory to come in and confirm
12 that what they had done was correct. So they did a
13 radioactive materials issue there, but I think the
14 documentation is fairly thorough that they took
15 care of that. But so far their position has been
16 that they didn't do any bio-weapon or chemical
17 weapon research there.

18 MR. SUTTER: Well, what did they find? I
19 have some inside sources, (INAUDIBLE) defensive bio
20 and chemical research.

21 MR. FORD: We haven't got anything
22 official back from them. I hate to tell you to
23 hurry up and wait, but I think at this point what
24 we've got to do is wait for the Army's response and
25 see what it is.

1 MR. O'HARA: What is your timetable?

2 MR. FORD: Well, my timetable is to bang
3 on the Army a couple times a week to make sure that
4 they understand that we need this soon. I don't
5 know what the precise demolition schedule is. I
6 believe I have roughly a couple more weeks before
7 this issue is going to affect the demolition
8 schedule. But that's essentially the schedule I'm
9 working on. I need to have a response from the
10 Army within the next two weeks.

11 MR. O'HARA: And your own investigative
12 work is parallel and not going out to alternative
13 resources?

14 MR. FORD: Yes. As far as where that
15 goes, it's somewhat dependant on what the Army
16 tells us. We really -- what it boils down to is,
17 we've got to get some kind of response from the
18 Army and take a look at it and see what they've
19 told us. Because their response could fit anywhere
20 in the spectrum from a one-sentence response
21 saying, "We told you we never did it. Now leave us
22 alone," to something more elaborate that actually
23 does include analytical protocols.

24 MR. O'HARA: What would your course of
25 action be if you get the one sentence response?

1 MR. FORD: It's a tough one to do that
2 what-if. But basically, what we'd be looking at is
3 finalizing our own program of analysis. We would
4 do that before any of these soils are exposed. As
5 to what exactly would be in the sampling protocol,
6 Right now, I don't know. We're still doing that
7 research. But we would have something in place.
8 It would have been submitted to DTSC and approved
9 by them before the floors come up.

10 MR. O'HARA: Bob, in your take on this, do
11 you have the same anxieties that neighborhood
12 groups do, and to what extent is the State prepared
13 to insist on support of our concerns? Not that you
14 wouldn't. I want to get a feeling of how the State
15 feels about this.

16 MR. BOGGS: I know there's a lot of
17 concern at my Agency. In fact, we're the ones that
18 directed the Trust to put the Sampling Plan
19 together. They would have put forth the notion
20 that two sampling rounds have been done. Typically
21 that would be sufficient for us to say, "Okay.
22 Yeah. Go do your work."

23 Because of the history, we do have special
24 concern for Letterman and LAIR in particular. I've
25 been directed to do some homework on my own, and

1 I've also found a few little things here and there,
2 things that have been used, etc, that may have been
3 of concern.

4 So there is a lot of concern at our Agency.
5 There's been concern to the extent of, we have a
6 retired military personnel lined up, that if we
7 need somebody with security clearance to know
8 through the Army what was used there, we can take
9 that route. My boss is very key on getting the
10 Army to document what we need to be concerned about
11 or not concerned about. Beyond what they tell us,
12 we don't have a lot of mechanisms to drag them into
13 court or anything, or to call them. We don't have
14 any information to call them liars either.

15 I think what our position is we have a fairly
16 extensive Sampling Plan being proposed by the
17 Trust. We remember looking at a lot of things. We
18 have some comments. We wanted to look at some
19 other things in addition to the sewers, any place
20 that could have been a concern. But we really do
21 want to get some assurance from the Army that none
22 of these things that we wouldn't commonly find we
23 needn't be worried about.

24 My boss' position on this goes to the extent
25 they can't start construction of anything new there

1 until the environmental stuff is cleared by this
2 Agency. And so he's very clear that before they
3 start constructing the campus, so to speak, we will
4 have covered potential environmental concerns.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Where does sewer go? If
6 anything ever was put into the sewer that shouldn't
7 have been, is it already gone to some place where
8 it shouldn't be?

9 MR. FORD: The answer is, if they did, it
10 has, and it happened a long time ago.

11 MR. ANDERSON: And where does it go?

12 MR. FORD: Basically, it heads northward.
13 There are several trunk sewers that all meet kind
14 of down near the driveway into the Letterman
15 Complex on Gorgas Street, which is the north end,
16 sort of the bay end of the site. The sewers all
17 come together and go out into a main sanitary sewer
18 which I believe -- and Tom, you can jump in if I
19 get the plumbing wrong -- it goes into a force main
20 where the sewage is actually pumped from a
21 collection point there through the municipal sewer
22 system, and it eventually goes --

23 MR. ANDERSON: The San Francisco Municipal
24 Sewer System?

25 MR. FORD: The San Francisco Municipal

1 Sewer System. And sewage from that area goes to
2 the treatment plant that is -- is it Northpoint --
3 okay. And there it's treated. Is there an outfall
4 off of Northpoint, or do they send it around on
5 Beach --

6 MR. KERN: It goes to the Southeast
7 Treatment Plant.

8 MR. FORD: Southeast? Okay.

9 MR. KERN: Northpoint is a wet-weather
10 flow only. It's not a sewage treatment.

11 MR. FORD: Well, we'll have to get a
12 little clearer on the details of the San Francisco
13 Sanitary plumbing system, but it's something to
14 keep in mind. The Army completely vacated LAIR by
15 1995. They started vacating it in '93, and it was
16 completely gone by '95. So whatever they were
17 doing hasn't been done there for at least six
18 years. If they did dispose of things down sanitary
19 sewers, in all likelihood they were flushed down
20 the sewers, so to speak, and sent out to the San
21 Francisco Treatment Plant, and subjected to the
22 normal sewage treatment when it discharged.

23 MR. ANDERSON: What's the likelihood that
24 they would be there at this time?

25 MR. FORD: Off the top of my head, I would

1 say the likelihood is very low but again --

2 MR. ANDERSON: And what about it's being
3 somewhere else, not in the sewer, but in the
4 material (INAUDIBLE).

5 MR. FORD: That's what our Sampling Plan
6 is designed to really look at, if there was a
7 release of any kind from the sewer.

8 MR. ANDERSON: No. What about the
9 building itself that you're in the process of
10 knocking down?

11 MR. FORD: I'd say it's more in past
12 tense. The building is pretty much knocked down.

13 MR. ANDERSON: (INAUDIBLE) rubble.

14 MR. FORD: Right.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Is there any possibility
16 that some agent might be just a part of that
17 rubble?

18 MR. FORD: Well, the buildings were pretty
19 thoroughly cleaned out between what the Army did,
20 and the Trust has gone through multiple rounds of
21 salvaging.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Is there a possibility of
23 contaminated materials? You can take everything
24 out of the room, but the room's still there. I
25 don't know. I'm just wondering.

1 MR. FORD: I don't know. I can tell you
2 that dozens to hundreds of abatement and salvage
3 workers have gone in and out of buildings for
4 months before the demolition started, and as far as
5 we know, there hasn't been any outbreaks of disease
6 traceable back to the site.

7 So I guess I don't really know the answer to
8 your question. I hope that the Army will be able
9 to show that they did a proper job of cleaning up
10 after themselves for materials besides -- I think
11 it's pretty clear they did do a proper job of
12 cleaning up after themselves as far as radioactive
13 materials. There's a clear record about that.
14 What we don't have right at the moment is a clear
15 record of what they did to clean up after
16 themselves as far as biohazards go.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Finally, how far do you
18 dismantle the sewer system, and how do you close it
19 off?

20 MR. FORD: Well, the demolition contract
21 requires that we essentially remove it all,
22 potentially back to a -- it's kind-of like a big
23 manhole collection point where several trunk sewers
24 come in. And that is close to the north edge of
25 the property. So our plan is --

1 MR. ANDERSON: North edge of Letterman?

2 MR. FORD: Yes, on the south side of
3 Gorgas Street.

4 MR. SUTTER: Although the Army has been
5 obviously going since '95, I thought they stopped
6 using Letterman and LAIR 20 years before that even.
7 I thought they hadn't used it since the 70's.

8 MR. FORD: No. Actually, LAIR itself was
9 constructed in phases between '72 and '76. It
10 didn't exist until the early to mid-70's.

11 MR. SUTTER: When did they last use it; do
12 you know?

13 MR. FORD: Well, the last time that they
14 -- it was fully occupied -- was early in 1993, I
15 believe. And then they started phasing out and
16 leaving it. And essentially by the end of 1993, I
17 think the Army was completely out of it. The US
18 Department of Agriculture remained there through
19 '94 and a portion of 1995, and they were using some
20 laboratory space essentially loaned to them by the
21 Army. But then nobody's been in there. There has
22 been no active research there since 1995.

23 MR. SUTTER: Yes. I was curious about the
24 demolition process. Are you going to be able to
25 demolish the basements, the sub-basements in a way

1 such that you can identify sections of sewer lines
2 that might have been cracked in the past? Are you
3 going to be able to do it so surgically that you
4 will be able to distinguish between an old cracked
5 section of the sewer or section of the sewer that's
6 damaged by the demolition?

7 MR. FORD: Well, I'd have to think about
8 that, but off the top of my head, I think the
9 answer is yes, that we will be able to distinguish
10 just because the through-put on the sanitary sewers
11 has been minimal in the last six years, and it's
12 been zero recently. So I would expect that we
13 ought to be able to -- I'm going to expect that old
14 breaks, you're going to see staining of the soil,
15 and you'll probably see staining of the edges of
16 the break. Kind of how you can sometimes tell with
17 a car? If there's a scrape on it and it's full of
18 rust, you know that it happened a long time ago.
19 But if it's fresh, you know that it's happened
20 recently. I would expect that we would be able to
21 make some judgments about the age of the breaks.

22 I think the other thing is that we are going to
23 have to exert some control over the demolition
24 operation. We're having discussions about that in
25 the Trust right now as to whether we will use the

1 demolition contractor to do this work, or whether
2 we will bring in a more specialized contractor.
3 The fact is, it will have to be done in such a
4 fashion that we can track the sewers from where
5 they exit the building, all the way back down the
6 line.

7 MR. SUTTER: I just had visions of the
8 demo contractors coming in and everything goes in
9 two hours.

10 MR. FORD: I'm sure that's exactly how
11 they'd like to do it. We're not going to let them
12 do it that way.

13 MR. BERMAN: In your investigations, do
14 you think that the Army -- At one time there was a
15 suspicion that they had a bevy of primates doing
16 various types of medical investigations.

17 MR. FORD: Yeah, they did. I know. I've
18 seen an inventory where they had 300 primates in
19 1989, I believe. The Army concedes that they had
20 300 primates in LAIR at the time that they did the
21 inventory.

22 MR. BERMAN: If I could just emphasize
23 what Peter was saying. It's likely that some type
24 of defensive and biological research was going on.
25 It's hard to figure out why they would have all of

1 that George is working with a fluid situation.
2 He's clearly getting input from people. I just
3 don't want to have a discussion that just goes on
4 and on and on. So if people have specific
5 requests, or questions, then George can say, "Okay,
6 I'll take that in," or, "Yes, I don't know," but
7 let's try to keep it focused on things that he can
8 actually use, and that will give you some kind of a
9 comfort level. And then we need to give our
10 reporter a break soon. Any other questions or
11 concerns on LAIR at this point?

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How will you update us
13 on what you find out from the Army?

14 MR. FORD: Well, I think what we've been
15 doing, Peter and I have had some Email
16 correspondence, and I think I've cc'd a few of you,
17 but since there is a great level of interest on the
18 Army's response, I would suggest that we Email it
19 around. Although now that I suggest that, I
20 probably will not get an electronic file from the
21 Army. I'm going to get a hard copy. I guess maybe
22 we'll scan it, and sent it around as a Jaypaig
23 (PHONETIC), and if it's 12 pages single-spaced,
24 what we'll do is read through it and try to provide
25 a bullet synopsis of what it actually says. I hope

1 those primates in there without something that
2 relates to a biological research program. And of
3 course, it's highly classified material because of
4 the political statements that have been made in the
5 past. So just as an amateur, it's very difficult
6 to think that they would have primate population
7 without doing some kind of biological/weapon
8 investigations.

9 MR. FORD: Well, and that's why -- What
10 we're trying to do it is strike a balance here. So
11 far, there is no evidence of any problems so far.

12 MR. BERMAN: There might not be a problem,
13 but it's just that the Army has said that they
14 didn't do that kind of work -- well, they didn't do
15 biological/weapon work there. What in the world
16 was 300 primates doing there?

17 MR. FORD: Three pigs, 2000 mice, animal
18 stories. Animal inventory was --

19 MR. BERMAN: That was a big activity at
20 LAIR. They had a lot of biologists there at the
21 time, too.

22 MR. KERN: I'd like to jump in here.
23 We've carrying this conversation a little bit far,
24 which is fine. It's obviously an important topic.
25 I would like to say it's my own view at the moment

1 that the next thing that I can get from the Army is
2 a commitment as to what date they will respond by.
3 That tells me whether I have a small problem or a
4 huge problem. We will plan on circulating it by
5 Email. If anybody can't get Email, either let me
6 know or Craig or Jane or Chris, and we'll figure
7 out another way to get it to you.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Has anyone contacted
9 Fineston or Pelosi? No. We've talked about that,
10 but my thinking on this -- I can't speak for the
11 whole Trust, but the idea was we want to give the
12 Army an opportunity to do the right thing before we
13 hit them over the head with a sledgehammer. And so
14 I think I see it as we're kind-of in that phase.

15 The initial indications are pretty good. I
16 was worried that the Army would just stonewall us
17 and not respond at all. They're not doing that.
18 They have made it clear that they will respond, and
19 that they are considering or researching. So I'm
20 hopeful that we will get a response that is
21 something more than one sentence.

22 (Break taken)

23 MR. FORD: Okay. So I guess we'll dive
24 back into Mountain Lake, so to speak. Normally I
25 can resist. But I'm sorry about that. DTSC sent

1 their first letter out on September 28th. My
2 understanding is they still haven't heard from
3 Caltrans. Has that changed in the last few days?

4 MR. BOGGS: No, that's correct. Our
5 lawyer is looking at the next step, which would
6 have normally been a Compliance Order.

7 MR. ANDERSON: To whom?

8 MR. BOGGS: To Caltrans, but they're not
9 real comfortable writing an order from one State
10 agency to another State agency. But our lawyer is
11 working on that.

12 MR. FORD: We'll just kind-of have to wait
13 and see. The hope is to get all the parties to a
14 table before the end of the year, to at least
15 discuss what the next step is.

16 MR. ANDERSON: And what are PRPs?

17 MR. FORD: Potentially responsible
18 parties, parties that have liability (INAUDIBLE).
19 Which I think for Mountain Lake, the PRPs are
20 considered to be the Trust, the Army, and Caltrans,
21 although my guess is that Caltrans and the Army
22 will both have theories about why they have PRPs.

23 MR. ANDERSON: You have a theory too,
24 don't you?

25 MR. FORD: Yes, I have a theory that they

1 marsh.

2 And we're also having a consultant put together
3 a work plan for the Commissary, the Post Exchange
4 site. And this is the overall site. We did a
5 cleanup in one corner of it earlier this year.

6 We're getting ready to take a look at the overall
7 property, and also a work plan for Building 1349.

8 MR. BOGGS: IP put together a work plan
9 for the Commissary a couple years when you were
10 here. Is that being used to put this one together?

11 MR. FORD: Yes. Basically, we used that
12 as a base for them to start. I instructed them to
13 build off of that, but also consider that they have
14 a blank piece of paper, and if after they reviewed
15 all the data, if they felt there were things that
16 should be done differently than IT was proposing to
17 do it, then I wanted the updated look.

18 So Treadmill and Rollo is doing that for us. I
19 don't know the precise schedule is, but I would say
20 roughly within two to three months we should have a
21 Work Plan coming out that you can look at. Those
22 of you who know the history of the commissary and
23 the PX area, that should be an exciting one to
24 investigate because the Army did all kind of --
25 every kind of vehicle maintenance or fueling or

1 are both guilty and they should bring money to the
2 first meeting. I don't think they will. And I
3 think people should expect this is going to be a
4 possess, trying to negotiate a three-way or
5 four-way negotiation (INAUDIBLE) DTSC, between
6 three PRPs and a regulatory agency. It's going to
7 take some time to clearly define the
8 responsibilities. I wouldn't look for a resolution
9 of the issue of who's paying early next year. It's
10 going to take awhile.

11 Next slide, the Building 1065 Corrective Action
12 Plan. Harding ESE are consultants who put together
13 a Work Plan to address the data gaps in the 1065
14 Petroleum Cleanup area. And we have been wrestling
15 with that. It appears to be in good shape, and
16 expect to mail it to the agencies and the RAB next
17 week. So you'll know when it arrives. It's about
18 three-and-a-half inches thick.

19 The Trust is getting additional studies for
20 future Corrective Action Plans going. We either
21 have issued or will momentarily issue purchase
22 orders to do additional characterization in the
23 207/231 Corrective Action Plan area, which also
24 happens to be right smack on top of the Tennessee
25 Hollow riparian corridor where it come down to the

1 tank car unloading, they did it down there. I
2 think it will be an interesting site to
3 investigate.

4 Building 1349 we think will be a fairly small
5 simple Corrective Action Plan. 1349 was a former
6 heating oil storage tank that is right across the
7 street from Fill Site 5. The tank's gone now. The
8 Army did a pretty substantial cleanup on the actual
9 site of the tank, but they didn't chase out all the
10 various odds and ends off the property. So the
11 1349 Corrective Action will be to chase down those
12 little fingers that are extended off the site.

13 MR. O'HARA: Is that the water (INAUDIBLE)
14 on top of --

15 MR. FORD: Yes. In that triangle between
16 Colby and Harrison and Washington.

17 MR. O'HARA: That 40,000 gallon?

18 MR. FORD: Yes. That's the one. As we
19 get this Corrective Action Plan going, we hope that
20 will be kind-of the final. We'll fix up everything
21 up there on top of the hill between Landfill 4 and
22 Fill Site 5 and the 1349 Petroleum.

23 And these will be spaced out. I'm kind-of
24 mentioning them all now because we are going
25 through our contracting process, but we're not

Page 69

1 going to dump all of these Corrective Draft Plans
2 for you to review in January. We're going to be
3 spacing them out over the next year to a year and a
4 half. We'll try to have them come out with
5 reasonable spacing between them so people can look
6 at them without being overwhelmed with the volume
7 of paper.

8 There are some smaller things happening in the
9 petroleum program. We are getting ready to do some
10 digging at very small mini-cap site on Liggett
11 Avenue and Lower Simonds. These are areas where
12 the Army removed small heating oil, 500-gallon
13 heating oil tanks at individual residential units,
14 and where they cleaned up most of the petroleum but
15 they didn't quite get it all. We are trying to go
16 back and finish those off.

17 Also, we have a hydraulic cylinder that we
18 discovered some months ago in the floor of Building
19 1937, which is one of the former airplane hangers
20 down at the west end of Crissy Field, and that will
21 be removed later this week.

22 The fun discovery that we had last week -- bad
23 fun -- we found a large fuel distribution system
24 tank at the dust bowl. The dust bowl is that big
25 valley. It's kind of a round valley that is

Page 70

1 bounded by the YMCA and Lincoln Boulevard and
2 Presidio Boulevard. Sort of a big pit with a tank
3 bottom. The Trust was planting some trees there
4 last week, full-size trees that have been taken off
5 of the Letterman Site, and right where they dug a
6 hole to put in one of these Italian Stone pines,
7 they found a tank. There is no record of any fuel
8 distribution system lines crossing there or any
9 tanks.

10 But we've looked at air photos. It appears
11 there was a building in that corner of the dust
12 bowl through at least the early 60's. We don't
13 know what the building was used for. But it's
14 pretty clear that this heating oil tank was there
15 as a terminal storage tank to feed the furnace. It
16 looks like it's about a 2000-gallon tank, so it's a
17 fairly good size. And we will be removing that as
18 soon as we can.

19 We should be removing it right now, but we've
20 run into a situation with the City of San
21 Francisco. We do tank removals under a permit from
22 the City of San Francisco. We go apply for one.
23 Apparently, they used to have two or three
24 inspectors who would come out to observe these tank
25 removals, but apparently the inspectors they had

Page 71

1 have all gone on to other responsibilities, and
2 they have one part-time fireman who works two days
3 a week doing the tank removals. And so actually
4 getting on the schedule just to have the guy come
5 out and oversee the removal is becoming a big
6 issue.

7 We will see how that goes. If it turns out
8 that the city's inability to provide an inspector
9 becomes a huge issue for our petroleum schedule,
10 we'll have to figure out another way. But for the
11 time being, we're trying to go on the schedule for
12 one guy who works two days a week.

13 MR. O'HARA: Are there other jurisdictions
14 you could go to to get inspectors?

15 MR. FORD: I don't think so. I believe
16 what the Army did -- If we run into a jam with
17 these inspectors, we'll probably look at doing
18 something like what the Army did, which was
19 essentially -- if I paraphrase this wrong, jump in
20 Brian -- I think the Army essentially proposed to
21 the Water Board that the Army would oversee their
22 own tank removals. They would do it in accordance
23 with the standards that the City would ask for
24 because the stuff that the City wants is pretty
25 basic, and it's stuff that we would do anyway. So

Page 72

1 in some sense, we really don't need an inspector
2 there looking over our shoulder because they're
3 just there to confirm that we're doing all the
4 stuff we're going to do anyway.

5 So what we would probably do is write a letter
6 to the Water Board and propose that we oversee our
7 own tank removals, and we'd have some conditions
8 that if we found any leaks -- See, if you're
9 removing a tank under San Francisco oversight, if
10 it comes out clean, then you send a report to the
11 city of San Francisco, and theoretically you're
12 done. If the tank leaks, if there's any evidence
13 of leakage, the City refers you to the Water Board
14 immediately for follow up as a leak case. So we'd
15 probably do something like that. We would approach
16 the Water Board and discuss whether we can come up
17 with some kind of compromise oversight,
18 self-oversight or have consultants oversee the work
19 that we do or something. Because to me, it doesn't
20 make sense, once we've geared up to do the tank
21 removal, to have to space it out and take five
22 years to do one year's worth of work because we
23 can't get City inspectors --

24 MR. O'HARA: If somebody's qualified to
25 inspect tanks in Sausalito or San Rafael or San

1 Francisco or San Mateo, and if somebody has got
2 that qualification, why rely on San Francisco if
3 they're dragging their feet? Bring somebody else
4 in as a third party.

5 MR. FORD: The Trust has a policy that we
6 are trying to be a good neighbor with San
7 Francisco.

8 MR. O'HARA: Is San Francisco trying to be
9 a good neighbor to the Trust?

10 MR. FORD: I think our official position
11 is, yes, they are. What I'd like to do is see how
12 it goes. It may turn out, if there aren't a lot of
13 tank removals going on over the City, maybe we can
14 monopolize the inspector's time. Two days a week
15 we could get most of that done. That's more than
16 enough. So what I would propose to do is, let's
17 give it a month or two and kind-of see how it goes.
18 And I'll report back.

19 If we are suffering unacceptable delays because
20 they can't send an inspector, I'll be looking for
21 Plan B. And at the moment, I don't know what it
22 is, but I can tell you that we will come up with a
23 plan.

24 MR. SUTTER: You've got a couple of months
25 on this, George?

1 rather than slow down.

2 We are still wrestling with the mini-CAP draft
3 work plan. These are big mini-CAPs, Building 42
4 and Buildings 100 to 104. Those are the big
5 historic brick barracks. Those are quite a bit
6 different than the projects we started on Liggett
7 Avenue and Lower Simonds, so we hope we're in the
8 final round of revision of that Work Plan so we can
9 see the light of day. But I'm not going to predict
10 a date because I have been wrong on this project
11 about a half a dozen times already. We've had a
12 lot of problems getting a work product that we can
13 use.

14 Next slide. Okay. Going downhill to Crissy
15 Field, the Skeet Range, we owe DTSC a final Field
16 Data Report and Work Plan. We sent out drafts some
17 time ago, but Bob needs finals so that then he can
18 approve the cleanup plan that we want to do. We
19 will be sending those documents. We need to send
20 them back through the Park Service for one more
21 look-see. That will be happening shortly, and then
22 we'll be sending them off to Bob.

23 We're also going to start the bidding process.
24 We have a set of plans and specs ready to go. I'd
25 actually hoped to have the complete process going

1 MR. FORD: Yes. Well, the truth is, we
2 don't were precisely how many tanks we have. We
3 have an estimate.

4 MR. SUTTER: Oh, so you're trying to get
5 the inspector to oversee a bunch of tanks. It's
6 not just this particular one.

7 MR. FORD: That's where I'm worried. This
8 one, we'll get out one way or the other. What I'm
9 more worried about is, we have paperwork that
10 suggests there could be as many as 56 tanks still
11 in the ground on the Presidio.

12 MR. BERMAN: Not in the dust bowl?

13 MR. FORD: No, not in the dust bowl. We
14 hope this will be the only thing we find in the
15 dust bowl. Those are the ones I'm really worried
16 about. This dust bowl is just kind of like, we
17 discovered we had a problem. It's more the
18 progress of getting the rest of those tanks out
19 that I'm worried about.

20 MR. SUTTER: If you run into a stone wall,
21 I might be able to help as a former city employee.
22 I know a few people here and there.

23 MR. FORD: Well, I may be coming to talk
24 to you shortly. It's taken us a long time to get
25 this going. We'd kind-of like to pick up speed

1 by now, but we haven't quite made it yet. But it
2 will be started next week or so. We'll be getting
3 bids from multiple contractors to do the work, and
4 a presumption we do the work in the spring.

5 MR. O'HARA: At the risk of beating a dead
6 horse here, how are you going to get the stuff
7 (INAUDIBLE) the mean tide level?

8 MR. FORD: What I want to do is what the
9 contractors tell us how they want to do it. The
10 specification we have is more of a -- it's a
11 performance specification that says these holes
12 have to be excavated and material has to be legally
13 disposed offsite. You tell us how to do it, and
14 then we'll take a close look. If somebody comes up
15 with a proposal and anything's goofy, we won't give
16 them the work. But what we're trying to do is
17 kind-of encourage the (INAUDIBLE) and creativity of
18 the contractors, and hope that they may have a
19 better solution for doing it than we do.

20 MS. YAROS: George, I'm not clear. Where
21 is this cleanup? Crissy Field looks as though it's
22 finished.

23 MR. FORD: This is right on the beach. It
24 isn't going to affect any of the sort-of finished
25 improved parts of Crissy Field. This is on the

1 beach near the west end of the marsh. The work is
2 occurring really right out on the front slope of
3 the beach.

4 MS. YAROS: So it's not a real big area.

5 MR. FORD: No, it isn't. It will be
6 visible when work's going on. There will be heavy
7 equipment there, and probably the most noticeable
8 thing will be that we will have to haul the sand
9 and skeet fragments that we remove out the
10 Promenade. So there will be party-loaded trucks
11 moving out on the Promenade. I would say,
12 generally speaking, most people aren't going to
13 notice that it's going on. Joggers who go out on
14 the Promenade on the beach are definitely going to
15 see it, but if you're just driving by on Mason
16 Street you probably would have to know that
17 something is happening in order to see it. It
18 should happen relatively quickly. I'm expecting it
19 will take something like two weeks to do the whole
20 job.

21 MS. YAROS: It's also in that area that
22 comes with the public restrooms?

23 MR. FORD: No. This is a -- I'm sorry I
24 don't have a map.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a few hundred yards

1 east of the Coast Guard Station. And if you're to
2 walk along the beach from the Coast Guard Station
3 to the east, you'll get to the point where the
4 beach is interrupted by rocks and riprap. That's
5 the location. It's on both sides of the riprap.
6 The beach is clean, if the riprap is clean again,
7 and it's just surrounding that riprap.

8 MS. YAROS: Thank you.

9 MR. FORD: And another Crissy Field item,
10 we're sending out a Building 937 follow up and
11 Closure Plan that's coming out? That's actually
12 being sent to DTSC for their review and also to the
13 Water Board?

14 Then Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. I should
15 point out that they started cutting trees in
16 Landfill 4 two weeks ago. The trees are all down
17 and most of the logs are gone, and they're just
18 grinding up the brush to turn it into mulch. Tree
19 removal at Fill Site 5 will start next Monday. So
20 that shall go a little faster. It should be all
21 done within 10 days to two weeks.

22 Where we are administratively on this project
23 is that the ARARs are still an issue. We're hoping
24 to get the ARARs in final form. We still welcome
25 any comments you might have on the preliminary

1 draft that we sent out. We think that the official
2 draft review period -- we are still shooting for
3 the month of January, with the 30-day public review
4 period will essentially be the month of January and
5 the public meeting will occur in mid- to
6 late-January when we present the report.

7 I don't anticipate any changes in that
8 schedule. I hope we've turned a corner on ARARs.
9 Right now I think the only thing that could derail
10 that schedule is an ARARs problem. But I hope that
11 we turned a corner, and now with ARARs, they're
12 getting better and not worse. And so we will be
13 able to get the Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 ARARs
14 final and put them into the draft, so that the
15 draft can then reviewed.

16 MS. HARRIS: Where are those public
17 meetings held?

18 MR. FORD: It's most likely to be held
19 here. As a general rule, we're going to try to
20 make the public meetings on the same day as the RAB
21 meeting. Normally what we'll try to do is convene
22 the public meeting say at 6:00 o'clock and run it
23 from six to seven, and then the regular RAB meeting
24 can start at seven.

25 Now having said that, we probably will not have

1 this meeting in January on the same day as the RAB
2 meeting. We have some people who are going to be
3 out of town in early January, and when we do the
4 public meeting, we want to have all the important
5 players there at the meeting. So it's likely that
6 we'll do it in the second half of January. I don't
7 know what the date is at the moment, but we are
8 going to be proposing a date pretty soon, and so
9 we'll send that around.

10 MS. WRIGHT: George, there has been some
11 talk of putting signs up? I wonder if you guys
12 have had any comments if any have been pulled down
13 (INAUDIBLE) in the Landfill 4 area?

14 MR. FORD: Unless the signs already got
15 removed, there were some signs up.

16 MR. O'HARA: There were signs up. I saw
17 them.

18 MS. WRIGHT: I went there twice and didn't
19 see it.

20 MR. FORD: The signs were out on Central
21 Magazine Road, where we were closing the gates.

22 MS. WRIGHT: Oh, they're on the trail?

23 MR. FORD: They should be, but now you've
24 got me wondering. We'll have to check. We'll have
25 to check.

1 MS. WRIGHT: In the really obvious places
2 where the road's being blocked off, and there's no
3 sign there except for the temporary road barrier.

4 MR. FORD: I'll take a look tomorrow
5 morning because there were signs there. They
6 should still should be there.

7 MS. WRIGHT: I just didn't see them, and I
8 didn't think it should be that hard to see.

9 MR. NELSON: There may not have been a
10 sign before the road barricade, and so it was
11 blocked because they didn't want people going in
12 and getting hurt.

13 MS. PACKER: If they were placed behind
14 the barricade, well, that doesn't make any sense.
15 We moved them outside the barricade. There's one
16 on the trail and then --

17 MS. WRIGHT: It's just on the other side
18 of the (INAUDIBLE) where people would stop would be
19 a logical place to put it.

20 MS. PACKER: Yes. I'll get that tomorrow.

21 MS. WRIGHT: Especially because Fill Site
22 5 will be a little more public. So those signs
23 will be up before the trees are pulled down on
24 Monday?

25 MR. FORD: They're scheduled to go up next

1 trouble out there so far.

2 MR. BERMAN: Everything was so
3 well-packaged that nothing got out, you mean?

4 MR. FORD: Well, presumably, if they
5 spilled anything, it blew up, I guess.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: (INAUDIBLE) that they did
7 do a test for batteries (INAUDIBLE) leaked. They
8 did have some light samples for explosive
9 compounds. The Army put out a fairly brief report
10 on that.

11 MR. KERN: Very brief.

12 MR. FORD: I think the plan is we'll keep
13 using Central Magazine for storage. It's pretty
14 secure storage because the bombproof door is there
15 and tough for the vandals to get through.

16 The last thing on this is that the Fish and
17 Wildlife Service has asked to review our Erosion
18 Control Plans for this site. We're trying to
19 comply with their request. We told them there
20 would be two plans, one for the construction phase
21 and one for a post-construction after we've removed
22 the fill.

23 They asked to see both of them. We had a
24 little bit of an issue because we want the
25 Construction Phase Plan to be written by the

1 week. We're probably a little closer than I would
2 like.

3 MS. WRIGHT: That will be the more visible
4 -- you kind-of have to go up the road to see them.

5 MR. BERMAN: Adjacent to Landfill 4,
6 you've got that old artillery site?

7 MR. FORD: Central Magazine?

8 MR. BERMAN: Right. Is that going to
9 remain there? If it's going to remain, will it be
10 closed off?

11 MR. FORD: Yes. The Trust is actually
12 using that for dry storage right now. I think the
13 plan is to keep using it for that in the
14 foreseeable future.

15 MS. WRIGHT: What kind of dry storage?

16 MR. FORD: For instance, our Asbestos
17 (INAUDIBLE) approves, they keep flat rolls of
18 plastic and stuff like that. They have pallets of
19 plastic and that sort of stuff.

20 MR. BERMAN: There is no CAP plan for that
21 building at all?

22 MR. FORD: As far as cleaning up? As far
23 as we know, there isn't any contamination out
24 there. Central Magazine is where they stored their
25 heavy-weight munitions. We have not identified any

1 contractor who's going to do the work so that they
2 can write a plan that will fit with their
3 operation.

4 Brian has suggested a path out of this dilemma,
5 and we're using his suggestion. What we're going
6 to send to the Fish and Wildlife Service is a
7 Perimeter Erosion Control Plan, where the Trust
8 will install some hay bales and sandbags and a few
9 other measures around the perimeter of Fill Site 5
10 to control any erosion and make sure no silt gets
11 off of the site. But we will leave the erosion
12 control measures for the center part of the site to
13 be determined by the contractor who is selected to
14 do the work.

15 MR. BOGGS: What we could also do is
16 actually have some minimum specs for erosion
17 control of your contractors that he put in the
18 scope of work. Not that you have to specify
19 exactly what they're going to do, but you specify
20 some minimum specs that may satisfy the Fish and
21 Wildlife Service as well. So we will require it of
22 your contractor, and as Best Management Practices
23 require.

24 MR. FORD: That's a good idea. What we're
25 trying to do here is have our cake and eat it too, and

Page 85

1 satisfy the Fish and Wildlife that we're doing the
2 right thing but not tie the hands of the contractor
3 too much.

4 MR. PONTON: (INAUDIBLE) permit for
5 construction.

6 MR. FORD: Do you know what the size
7 threshold needs to be --

8 MR. PONTON: It needs to be 5 acres.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Has it decreased yet?

10 MR. PONTON: It's in the process. I'm not
11 sure (INAUDIBLE).

12 MR. FORD: Okay.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Jim, doesn't that permit
14 fall within the RAP? The RAP would supersede the
15 on-site permit requirements (INAUDIBLE) if they
16 start to comply with the functional requirements?

17 MR. PONTON: I don't know.

18 MR. FORD: We will be talking to you about
19 that. Thanks.

20 I think we have one more slide. I love these
21 kind of pictures. We've been working on Landfill
22 4/Fill Site 5 for a while. Two weeks ago was the
23 first time we actually physically did anything on
24 the site. I'm generally not in favor of cutting
25 down trees, but I have to admit it was nice to

Page 87

1 I do plan to finalize them and get those moving. I
2 do plan to be a little more involved than I have
3 been in the last month.

4 The other thing I'd like to say is that I think
5 it's pretty important that we see the groundwater
6 monitoring results for this site, given that there
7 has clearly been no results collected in the last
8 couple years, before we can really look at the FS
9 and make a proper evaluation of what's being
10 described in there. So I'm anxious to see those
11 groundwater results for FS evaluation. That's
12 about it.

13 MR. KERN: Any questions for Jim? Any new
14 business?

15 MS. CHEEVER: Not really new business.
16 But I have a minor suggestion or request about
17 meetings. While at the same time thanking the
18 Trust for the various informative presentations, I
19 think sometimes a map would help both for us RAB
20 members and also for people in the public. I don't
21 know if you could just at least have a large
22 posterboard map that we could refer to, or I don't
23 know if it's technologically possible to have a map
24 on the slide that you can refer to without using
25 the order of your other slides and even have a

Page 86

1 actually see something happen on this site.

2 MR. NELSON: It's a lot sunnier up there
3 now.

4 MR. FORD: Yes. A big window has been cut
5 into the eucalyptus. Give it a few more days for
6 all the brush to be chipped, and then we should be
7 removing the road barricades. If you're driving
8 around or walking out there, just go down Central
9 Magazine and take a look. You can see the limits
10 of the landfill, and you can see what we'll be
11 working on next spring. That's it for me. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. KERN: Bob. Any update from you?

14 MR. BOGGS: I think I've interjected
15 enough already.

16 MR. KERN: Jim?

17 MR. PONTON: Just a couple things. I just
18 want to explain that in early September, I wrote a
19 letter explaining that staffing issues -- basically
20 I've been working a lot at Hamilton, that I'd be
21 not spending as much time on the Presidio until
22 December. So next week we take Hamilton to the
23 Board, or the week after next to the Board, and
24 after that I should have a lot more time. So I do
25 plan to -- I've sketched out comments on the ARARs.

Page 88

1 closeup. Because it seems there's constantly
2 questions about where is this.

3 MR. NELSON: We have a big
4 posterboard-size map with a laser pointer. We can
5 indicate the location.

6 MR. FORD: Yes. We'll bring that. We can
7 also do closeups for specific sites, put them on
8 the slides. I think that's a good idea.

9 MR. SUTTER: I had a question regarding
10 the site. I'd like at some point to be able to see
11 the various sites being worked on, or planned to be
12 worked on. I understand that periodically there
13 are tours that are given to RAB members, and maybe
14 there are other members that would be interested in
15 spending half a day and just eye-balling what
16 you're considering. I don't know if that would
17 impact upon the Trust's work schedule.

18 MR. FORD: We can do that. The only thing
19 I would suggest is that, from my own experience, a
20 half a day touring, that's a huge bite in terms of
21 nobody can stand to listen to me babbling for four
22 hours at a crack. It might make more sense to do a
23 couple of them that are an hour or two long just
24 because it's a little easier to assimilate
25 information if you're not seeing 15 different sites

1 in on outing.

2 MR. SUTTER: I'd be most sensitive to your
3 time requirements or whoever it would be. I'm
4 pretty flexible.

5 MR. FORD: We can set that up. We'll put
6 our heads together and propose something.

7 MR. NELSON: We did one last fall for the
8 new RAB members. One was only about an hour and a
9 half. It was in the evening. The season right now
10 is not such a great time to do an evening
11 unfortunately because it gets dark at 5:30.

12 MR. FORD: That's better; then they can't
13 see.

14 MR. O'HARA: The Trust conducted one at
15 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 last summer, and we met
16 before and we walked the area up there before the
17 meeting. And I would think that from your
18 standpoint, seeing this in daylight, if you can
19 bear with it until April, until daylight saving
20 time kicks in again, it would be a lot more
21 beneficial.

22 The other thing is to get a map of what's going
23 on and drive or walk around and take a look at it,
24 and then take a guided tour and the specifics of
25 what's going on or where in the process we are.

1 to be able to do a self-guided tour. If I was, I
2 could do it at that way. I'd really love to get
3 the technical information at the same time that I
4 actually eye-ball.

5 MR. NELSON: We'll get Jane to send out a
6 map of all the sites to all the new RAB members as
7 soon as possible. We'll work on getting the
8 daytime tour going for those people who can attend.

9 MR. BOGGS: You can propose some dates for
10 it.

11 MR. NELSON: Is everyone reachable by
12 E-mail during the day?

13 MR. SUTTER: Jane has my fax at home.

14 MR. KERN: Any other new items? I have a
15 brief question. I'm wondering if anyone tonight is
16 prepared to talk about sites like Landfill 4/Fill
17 Site 5 that might be being pushed out ahead,
18 possible remediation, and more near-term kind-of
19 scheduling like Baker Beach 3-kinds of -- we didn't
20 hear anything about that. Is that kind of in the
21 planning stage or --

22 MR. FORD: Yeah, they are. Our current
23 thinking is that we would like to clean up Baker
24 Beach Disturbed Area 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6 next
25 summer. And so in order -- not knowing whether the

1 MR. SUTTER: Again, I'm retired, and I've
2 got lots of time on my hands, so daytime wouldn't
3 be difficult for me. But again, I wouldn't want to
4 impinge upon --

5 MR. FORD: No, that's relatively easy to
6 do if you're available in the daytime. We could
7 set something up pretty quickly.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Does (INAUDIBLE) for the
9 new RAB members which ones are available during
10 weekdays generally?

11 MS. HARRIS: I'd like to echo what you're
12 saying. I'm also available during the day and
13 would be pleased to have a tour.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Peter had a good point.
15 In the springtime, it's a lot easier to do it early
16 evening and catch more people who have other
17 commitments during the day. But there are a number
18 of things that are going to come up between now and
19 April. I think you're going to want some
20 foundation for the discussion. It would be good if
21 we just focused on those things that are more
22 likely to be at the heart of the discussion. It
23 would certainly help you participate.

24 MR. SUTTER: I'd really appreciate that.
25 I'm not that familiar yet with the entire process

1 Feasibility Study will go final, we don't have a
2 base-wide RAP until the Feasibility Study goes
3 final. We're thinking the way to ensure that we
4 could do a significant chunk of work next summer
5 would probably be to pull those sites out and give
6 them their own RAP. The Trust is -- We're taking
7 steps down that path right now. We're trying to
8 get the contracts in place. That's another thing
9 that will be up on the radar screen shortly. We
10 don't have a whole lot to report right now, but I
11 would say that by January, we will start having
12 things to report.

13 MR. KERN: Anything else under Item 9?
14 Action Items. These are the 103 things that George
15 committed to do tonight.

16 List of objectives on the Landfill E to be
17 circulated. You committed to do a map of the
18 groundwater program for Sam, for every single one
19 of them.

20 MR. FORD: Right. It's going to be a map.

21 MR. KERN: You committed to finding out
22 the release of the groundwater report date. And
23 that's (INAUDIBLE).

24 There is a variety of things too numerous to
25 mention around the LAIR project that you're in deep

1 on now, I'm sure.
 2 The 1065 CAP is coming out. That's kind of on
 3 our plate to review that when that comes up. It
 4 appears that there is a little message from Jim
 5 about a possible permit issue. And there's maps
 6 for RAB members. There's going to be a tour
 7 proposed. Those are some of the things that I
 8 found.
 9 There's a small proposal that was made at the
 10 (INAUDIBLE) about portable heaters for the next
 11 meeting?
 12 MS. WRIGHT: Ergonomic chairs?
 13 MR. KERN: Ergonomic chairs. Anything
 14 else for action items?
 15 Agenda Items. Dennis, before he left,
 16 mentioned to me to try to get on our next committee
 17 meeting a rundown of the budget. We've had that
 18 previously at committee meetings. It would be
 19 great if we could have something like that at our
 20 next committee meeting.
 21 Okay. Any other agenda items coming up?
 22 MR. YOUNGKIN: We're putting out a new
 23 roster pretty soon, I believe. So if anybody has
 24 any additions or changes to the addresses --
 25 MS. PACKER: I put that in the mail last

1 week. It should be in your mailboxes, if not
 2 today, tomorrow.
 3 MR. FORD: We're also going to do name
 4 plates for new RAB members who don't have them.
 5 MS. WRIGHT: And Jane, this is kind of
 6 minor, but people keep mailing things to my old
 7 address, so if you could check the database and use
 8 the current one for mailing.
 9 MR. FORD: Why do you move around so much?
 10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Tax reasons.
 11 MR. KERN: Are there any other items
 12 tonight? Any announcements? Without any further
 13 ado, meeting adjourned. Thanks for coming out
 14 tonight.
 15 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
 16 9:45 p.m.)

17 ---oOo---
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 ATTENDANCE
 2 RAB MEMBERS
 3 Jerry Anderson
 4 Sam Berman
 5 Joel Berman
 6 Bob Boggs, EKI
 7 Julie Cheever
 8 Craig Cooper
 9 Dennis Downing
 10 George Ford
 11 Matt Fottler
 12 Willard Harris
 13 Doug Kern
 14 Scott Miller
 15 Jan Monaghan
 16 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
 17 Peter O'Hara
 18 Jane Packer
 19 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
 20 David Sutter
 21 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
 22 Tracy Wright
 23 Gloria Yaros

24 ---oOo---
 25

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 1

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB
PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

November 13, 2001
7:00 p.m.

COPY

Page 3

about three or four years, and I promise not to get in Doug's way.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm Mark Youngkin, and I'm a community member and community co-chair. I've been a member since 1996, and I'm a neighbor. I live on Clay and Presidio.

MS. YAROS: I'm Gloria Yaros. I'm also a community member, and I've been on the board for a little over a year.

MR. BOGGS: Bob Boggs. Cal EPA.

MS. WRIGHT: Tracy Wright, community member since '97 or '98, and I'm also a neighbor.

MR. FOTTLER: Matthew Fottler, community member, and on the Board since '96.

MS. CHEEVER: Julie Cheever, community member since 1996. And Ford with the Trust since.

MR. FORD: George Ford, with the Trust since 1999, and I'm the manager of Remedial Construction. And I should also, while we're going around, let me do a quick introduction. On my left here is Craig Cooper who is the new Remediation Program Manager at the Trust who started last week. We've been introducing him to the various projects. He'll do a little more complete introduction of himself a few minutes into the program.

Page 2

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB, PRESIDIO BUILDING 135

November 13, 2001
7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

MR. KERN: Welcome everyone, to the November, 2001 meeting in a new location. A bunch of new RAB members tonight, and so it seems like it would be a fitting thing to do to go around the room and do some introductions again. Some people may not know everybody that's here. There's room at the table, Jim. We see you over there.

I'm getting a little interference from Sam. He's sitting right next to me. It's going to be a difficult meeting.

I'm going to start. I'm Doug Kern. I've facilitated meetings now for a little while, in fact, two years. I'm a community member of the RAB.

MR. BERMAN: I'm Sam Berman, and I'm a community member of the RAB. I've been here for

Page 4

MR. ULLENSVANG: Brian Ullensvang with the Park Service.

MR. BERMAN: I'm Joel Berman. I'm a neighbor. I'm a new member.

MS. PACKER: I'm Jane Packer with the Trust. I'm the Community Relations Director.

MR. NELSON: Chris Nelson with the President Trust since 1999, and my favorite color is blue.

MR. O'HARA: I'm Peter O'Hara, and I'm a community member and a neighbor and on the Board since 1994.

MR. DOWNING: Dennis Downing, community member for a little over a year. I live in Marin.

MR. ANDERSON: Jerry Anderson, a community member. I live in San Rafael.

MS. HARRIS: I'm Willard Harris, community member and a new person. I live in Haight Ashbury, or the lower Twin Peaks or the Valley, take your pick.

MS. MONAGHAN: I'm Jan Monaghan, a community member, and I'm an original member from '94 as well, and I live in Pacific Heights.

MR. MILLER: Scott Miller, also a community member from the beginning, and former

1 tenant of the facility here.

2 MR. SUTTER: Dave Sutter, and I'm a new
3 community member. I live up in Twin Peaks.

4 MR. PONTON: I'm Jim Ponton, and I'm with
5 the Water Board, and I live here in Twin Peaks.

6 MR. KERN: I'd like to welcome everyone
7 to the meeting tonight, the Trust, Park Service,
8 Regulatory Community, our community members, and
9 any members of the public that are here. Thank you
10 for coming out. Any contractors for the Trust,
11 welcome here tonight. Does everyone have an
12 agenda? Are there any additions or changes to the
13 agenda? Seeing none, let's move on to Item No. 3.
14 That would be George and Craig.

15 MR. FORD: Okay. I actually have two
16 things to introduce here. One is -- let's start
17 off with the building. Welcome to Building 50.
18 This will be where we have the RAB meetings from
19 now on, in the foreseeable future. As you can see,
20 it's been nicely redone. I have a little personal
21 history with this building because I got married on
22 the Presidio in 1979, and we had our wedding
23 reception here, in fact, in this room and that
24 room. The roast beef was just about where Doug is
25 right now.

1 MR. KERN: I wish it was there right now.

2 MR. FORD: And so I have a lot of fond
3 memories of this building. Remember to tell your
4 friends, this is where we come for the meetings on
5 Tuesday night in the future. The building is
6 also available; if you would like to rent it for
7 something, you want to call Steve Overman at the
8 Presidio Trust, and he can set you up with whatever
9 we need. Having gotten the sales pitch out of the
10 way, I'd like to reintroduce Craig Cooper, who is a
11 new addition to the Trust Remediation staff, and he
12 will be the Remedial Program Manager taking over
13 the lion's share of Sharon's responsibilities.
14 Sharon is staying with the Trust and will be doing
15 more -- she'll be more in a liaison role within the
16 Trust. So you will still see her around, but Chris
17 and Craig and I will be faces that you see at most
18 of the RAB meetings and RAB committee meetings.
19 Craig will tell you a little bit about himself and
20 his history.

21 MR. COOPER: Okay. I know that we have a
22 lot to talk about tonight, so I'll try to be brief,
23 but I thought I'd give you at least a thumbnail
24 sketch of who I am and where I've been, and I look
25 forward to talking to you all more and working with

1 you all.

2 I'm a native Californian. I was born in
3 Modesto, and I went to UC Santa Barbara where I got
4 a degree in chemical engineering. After that, I
5 joined the Peace Corps, and upon coming back from
6 the Peace Corps, I got a job at the EPA, the
7 Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal EPA.
8 I first started out in the water division there,
9 working in construction grants on sewage treatment
10 plant systems, and in 1989, I transferred over to
11 the Superfund Program where I've been a Superfund
12 Project Manager ever since, until I started here
13 last week. I worked on Superfund sites in Arizona
14 and in Southern California, and the last Superfund
15 site I worked on for the last year and a half was
16 the Casmala (PHONETIC) Hazardous Waste landfill on
17 the Central Coast.

18 While working at UPA I went to University of
19 San Francisco, and I got a master's degree in
20 Environmental Management. And that's pretty much
21 my story. I look forward to working out in the
22 Presidio.

23 This is a great place. I think we've got a
24 great mandate before us to do some great work here,
25 and I look forward to getting to know all of you

1 and getting to understand all of your concerns and
2 your desires and looking forward to making some
3 progress. I have a stack of business cards here,
4 so maybe after the meeting we can talk some more.
5 That's it.

6 MR. KERN: Well, welcome to the Presidio
7 Craig, and I'm sure you're going to get lots of
8 input from all these folks. They're a bashful
9 group. We'll have to actually put a bag on this
10 guy, and just totally enclose him.

11 MR. BERMAN: Well, I will tell you that I
12 took a tranquilizer before I came here.

13 MR. ANDERSON: If Sharon has a different
14 role with respect to the group here -- is she still
15 co-chair, or will she be --

16 MR. FORD: Actually, the plan is that the
17 -- kind of official contact points that Sharon had,
18 RAB co-chair, and she's also the designated point
19 of contact for various regulatory entities, we'll
20 be swapping Craig's name in shortly. I think that
21 will happen next week.

22 MR. KERN: Committee reports.

23 MS. YOUNG: We had our Planning Committee
24 Meeting on the 23rd of October. We meet the fourth
25 Tuesday of every month at Building 1750 which is

Page 9

1 the old Army Reserve Center down by Lobos Creek,
2 the engineering and maintenance facility, and we
3 had a good meeting. We had a good turnout. We
4 started out with an update on current activities
5 provided by George Ford from the Presidio Trust,
6 and he went through a variety of things that are
7 going on now, like the letter about the storm
8 drains, Sampling Plan, and other projects.

9 And then Julie Cheever, one of our members,
10 gave us a presentation on the newsletters that the
11 RAB has been contributing articles to for about the
12 last five years, something like that. We went
13 through the history of our newsletter involvement,
14 and we went over some of the upcoming articles that
15 will be in the newsletter. If anybody has ideas,
16 or would wish to write articles for the newsletter,
17 let Julie know.

18 We also ended up on a discussion on Landfill E.
19 We had a review of the October 22nd Stakeholder
20 Meeting and a pretty long discussion of the issues
21 and objectives surrounding that Sampling Plan that
22 will be coming up in December, I believe, the Draft
23 Sampling Plan. And our next meeting will be again
24 the fourth Tuesday of this month, December 27th, at
25 Building 1750. Bring some water or some change for

Page 10

1 the soda machine. See you there. Thank you.

2 MR. KERN: Thanks Mark. Any questions for
3 Mark?

4 MR. SUTTER: As a new member, I had a
5 question of Julie as to the "newsletter." What is
6 it and what is the distribution of it? Where does
7 it go and so forth?

8 MS. CHEEVER: Well maybe this is partly a
9 question for Jane as well. Whatever Agency has
10 been cleaning up, formally the Army, and now the
11 Trust, puts out a periodic newsletter about the
12 cleanup. And about five years ago, we started
13 having a RAB article in it of different types,
14 maybe some of our own research on something like
15 Nike Missile Site or just a discussion of landfills
16 or updates on what the RAB has been doing. And
17 it's now going into something we appreciate, which
18 is kind-of a RAB page in what is now the Presidio
19 Trust Cleanup News. And a new one is soon to come
20 out. We can get it from Jane. But basically, we
21 say the Newsletter, but it's basically the Trust
22 Newsletter. We have one page where we write about
23 things from the RAB's point of view, but in a
24 fairly straightforward way. It's not editorials.
25 Jane, what about when the next one is coming out?

Page 11

1 MS. PACKER: Actually, all the articles
2 we're working on (INAUDIBLE) as of today. So I
3 work with her on the set-up and everything, so it
4 should be within a week, most likely. Usually I
5 sent them to all RAB members. I have a mailing
6 list on my computer. You'll be receiving one in
7 the mail.

8 MR. SUTTER: Is it a monthly?

9 MS. PACKER: We're required by DTSC for a
10 quarterly report. This one will be in November.
11 We're trying to get it on a more accurate basis. I
12 think you had mentioned in the Committee Meeting
13 that you wanted to do two; is that right?

14 MS. CHEEVER: A year?

15 MS. PACKER: Right.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Well, you're required to do
17 four.

18 By the way, another thing you said, recently
19 the Trust went over the mail list, because there
20 are a lot of outdated names on it, but you welcome
21 suggestions for people to be on the mailing list.
22 So if anybody has suggestions of people from your
23 neighborhood, please forward them to Jane, because
24 you're trying to rebuild the list.

25 MS. PACKER: Yeah, I'm trying to rebuild

Page 12

1 the list that the Army once had. Prior to my
2 coming here, the list was revamped, and we lost a
3 lot of people, so we're at a good number, but I'd
4 like to increase circulation.

5 MR. SUTTER: Does it go out to community
6 groups in San Francisco?

7 MS. PACKER: Mostly Presidio-based groups,
8 people who have concerns about what's going on
9 here, but I'd love to have ideas of different
10 community groups in the City that would be
11 interested in getting any thoughts or comments.

12 MR. SUTTER: I'll think about it.

13 MS. PACKER: Great.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Sam reminded me that at
15 the Committee Meeting, we also talked about the
16 ARARs for a little while, and we've tentatively
17 scheduled a meeting about the ARARs with Trust
18 people. But that has been postponed, so basically
19 it's postponed, the discussion, to a later
20 committee meeting that has not been rescheduled --

21 MR. KERN: Any other questions on the
22 committee reports? Let's move on them to Item No.
23 5, and Chris Nelson and the status update.

24 MR. NELSON: -- thank you, Doug. As is
25 customary for those new RAB members here this

Page 13

1 evening, or members of the public, you frequently
2 hear me talking about a variety of projects that
3 are going in the Presidio. I work mostly on
4 (INAUDIBLE) projects, and also (INAUDIBLE)
5 Presidio-wide projects. So without further ado.

6 The Presidio-wide Contingency Plan. The
7 status has not changed much since the last meeting
8 that we had in October. We have gotten some
9 changes that were necessary and incorporated into
10 the document, and the only thing that's pending at
11 this point is the ARARs which we are anticipating
12 receiving some comments from DTSC on soon, which we
13 will then incorporate and make any changes to the
14 document. I'm hoping we can get this document out
15 later this year (INAUDIBLE). However there are
16 some public meeting issues surrounding the release
17 of the documents, so we'll keep you posted on that.
18 We don't want to schedule a public meeting right
19 around the holidays.

20 Just a brief synopsis of what the Contingency
21 Plan is for those of you who don't know. For every
22 area of the Presidio that's designated either by
23 sites or by geography -- sometimes it's an
24 inoperable unit -- there will be a Cleanup Plan on
25 Remedial Action Plan to point out areas of

Page 14

1 contamination and levels of contamination and what
2 the appropriate remedy is. The Contingency Plan
3 covers areas in the Presidio that have not yet been
4 identified but are either suspected or we
5 anticipate that we'll find some unknown
6 contamination that was not pointed out by the Army.
7 This document will cover procedures, cleanup
8 methods to follow, notifications, et cetera, when
9 we find that contamination.

10 Moving on to the Main Installation Feasibility
11 Study under the CERCLA program. The greatest
12 amount of activity recently on the Feasibility
13 Study was the Field Investigations. In September,
14 we inserted soil gas probes around the Battery
15 Howe/Wagner site at Fort Scott, and they were in
16 the ground for approximately two weeks. We got the
17 results back in draft form, and they're being
18 reviewed and incorporated into a document at this
19 time. Unfortunately, there was no smoking gun to
20 indicate a source because that sort-of further
21 muddies the water, what could have caused this
22 contamination in the groundwater of that site. I'm
23 sure we'll be looking into it more carefully as the
24 report comes out.

25 On the additional data sites, we submitted a

Page 15

1 Sampling Plan which was approved by DTSC. Those of
2 you who don't recall, it was titled, "Field
3 Sampling Plan Addendum No. 4," and it covered the
4 five sites listed here on direction from DTSC this
5 year. We began a field effort last week, and did
6 some direct push investigations at Building 215 and
7 1244. We anticipate the work to be completed by
8 Thursday of this week and doing some step-out
9 samplings of areas and also some hand auger
10 (PHONETIC) borings in some of the more shallow
11 locations that are difficult to access. Once
12 these analytical results are in, and we have them
13 analyzed and interpreted, we'll have a report out
14 for review.

15 MR. BERMAN: A question. On the carbon
16 tet, has the source area been identified?

17 MR. NELSON: Well, as a result of the low
18 levels -- I think there were 15 sample locations
19 and there were only 12 hits, so any BFC altogether
20 (INAUDIBLE) I can't remember if there were multiple
21 hits in one location, but they were all very, very
22 low. And that speaks further to what I said about
23 there not being a smoking gun. There was no area
24 that was exceptionally high or even high in carbon
25 tetrachloride to indicate that there may have been

Page 16

1 a spill or there may have been a hot spot in the
2 groundwater (INAUDIBLE) soil gas. So I think from
3 the standpoint of searching for the source, it
4 would have been more fortunate to have found
5 something like that because it would make it a lot
6 easier to address the problem. At this time,
7 without definitive information from this data, it's
8 hard to say where the source is coming from,
9 whether it's upgradient or -- We know from looking
10 at the groundwater that the highest concentrations
11 have been detected upgradient, so it indicates an
12 upgradient source in the soil at some point.
13 However, the soil gas does not support that at that
14 time.

15 MR. BERMAN: But you think you've gone far
16 enough upgradient to get beyond where the
17 suspicious stuff -- even though there's not a
18 smoking gun --presumably you've taken some samples
19 far enough upgradient so you can be assured that
20 you've gone beyond where the guess is.

21 MR. NELSON: I'm using conventional
22 methods of investigating the sources. I think so,
23 yes. It's possible that there was some spill or
24 some activity that was never reported, and that is
25 what caused the contamination. But just look at

1 their historical records and evaluating past uses
2 of buildings and looking at aerial photographs and
3 looking at things like that, we took our best shot
4 at evaluating areas where there were buildings that
5 once had any type of chemical use associated with
6 it, whether it was storage, cleaning, dry cleaners,
7 things like that, gas stations. That was the sort
8 of thing we were looking for. We placed the
9 samples, the soil gas probes, in those areas,
10 hoping if there had been some intensive use that
11 perhaps a spill would capture that. But it did
12 not.

13 MR. BERMAN: Is there any possibility that
14 it could have been a source within the carbontet
15 that was not being picked on this soil gas
16 contaminations? Is there some chemistry or some
17 possibility that something would show up in the
18 groundwater that would not show up in soil gas?

19 MR. NELSON: I'm not a chemist, so I
20 wouldn't be able to speak definitely to that, but
21 what I could say is, what's been found in the past
22 in surveys like this is that if enough time goes
23 by, the chemical essentially dissipates in the soil
24 and the majority of the contamination is in the
25 groundwater. And so what we're finding is a source

1 that is no longer definitive, and the most likely
2 place to find it is in its resting place, which is
3 the groundwater. I think Craig or Brian have a
4 little bit more chemistry background.

5 MR. FORD: Usually, carbontets are fairly
6 volatile solvents, and so it's normally pretty good
7 for tracking volatiles. It's one of the best
8 techniques (INAUDIBLE). But you have to look at a
9 wide area to try to -- You don't know where the
10 source is, and you're trying to find it by sampling
11 a lot of different volatiles. Soil gas works
12 really well for finding volatiles.

13 MR. BERMAN: Right. Unless the source is
14 really upstream, much further than you suspect.
15 And so they did not -- you're pecking in an area
16 where there's a minimal amount of soil gas just
17 from the transfer from the groundwater, but the
18 real source is way upgradient.

19 MR. FORD: Yeah, I guess we've got to look
20 at the data that brings it out, (INAUDIBLE) beneath
21 the battery or something else. I remember looking
22 at Exploration Plan. It covered a pretty wide
23 area. It sure seems like if there was a source in
24 the neighborhood it likely would have fallen inside
25 the soil gas (INAUDIBLE). We'll have to look at it

1 and figure it out. If it is possible that it's
2 even farther upgradient, we should be able to
3 figure out that possibility. If that turns out to
4 be the case, then maybe we can go back for another
5 route. I'd be surprised if that ends up being the
6 case. I guess we'll see once we get all the data.

7 MR. BOGGS: Does the Field Study include
8 repeated sampling of the groundwater that showing
9 the carbon tetrachloride?

10 MR. NELSON: Well, the groundwater
11 monitoring program that's currently underway will
12 capture and monitor groundwater and (INAUDIBLE).

13 MR. BOGGS: Have there been any samples
14 that confirm that anything is still there?

15 MR. NELSON: It's consistently shown up in
16 the groundwater, carbon tetrachloride, yes. Is
17 that what you're asking?

18 MR. BOGGS: Yes.

19 MR. NELSON: There wasn't any plan in
20 place to go after no-hits. I guess there was more
21 a plan in place to go after hits. And we found
22 this smoking gun, (INAUDIBLE) terminology that I
23 use. We were hoping that would help us use more
24 direct methods than saying, "It's really hot here.
25 Let me take a soil sample and see." And that would

1 sometimes lead to that area that you suspect is the
2 worst.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (INAUDIBLE)

4 MR. NELSON: I believe May and August.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So are those wells
6 consistent with the history? Are they historical,
7 or are they showing increases or --

8 MR. NELSON: I don't recall what the
9 results were. I think they were comparable.

10 MR. FORD: I have not seen August either.
11 I think the manual is also fairly comparable.

12 MR. COOPER: It's a good point, though.
13 We used to see a trend in groundwater
14 concentrations, and groundwater concentrations are
15 going up, (INAUDIBLE) but if groundwater
16 concentrations remain the same or going down, that
17 means the source could be dissipated out of the
18 soils (INAUDIBLE).

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think one thing is that
20 there is one well downgradient from Battery, away
21 from where the suspected source area might
22 (INAUDIBLE) this has been pointed out as the
23 highest level of upgradient. One downgradient
24 (INAUDIBLE) early in their study process. It's
25 been fairly consistent in the level of carbontet

1 for years. So prior to the work of Trust, we had
 2 what appeared to be a fairly steady situation out
 3 there. So I think you could look at one well --
 4 often won't move around as much if the other one's
 5 stable, or if it does, it starts to show
 6 (INAUDIBLE) pools. We kind of pick that up. I
 7 think Sam, one thing you were talking about is
 8 trying to see if transport groundwater would
 9 necessarily reflect in the soil gas. There was a
 10 soil gas sample collected near the well tide. That
 11 came up negative, and that was a (INAUDIBLE)
 12 hypothesis, that maybe it's transported without
 13 volatilizing. And so once the data gets to a
 14 reviewable form, we can go and explore that
 15 question in detail.

16 MR. NELSON: Any more questions on that?
 17 Thank you.

18 On the Feasibility Study Report itself, our
 19 consultant Erle & Cowanowski is revising the
 20 document. We were a little bit sidelined in the
 21 last few weeks getting the Field Sampling Plan out
 22 and getting out in the field. So we're working on
 23 getting the Trust and Park Service another review
 24 version that we hope to get out to the public in
 25 December.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Chris, are the ARARs part of
 2 the Feasibility Study?

3 MR. NELSON: Yeah. The ARARs was
 4 technically -- it's a portion of the Feasibility
 5 Study that's required to be included as part of the
 6 guidance document for the EPA. The traditional
 7 process was to include the ARARs. And what we did
 8 was -- We were hoping to get an early analysis and
 9 input on the ARARs for a variety of documents that
 10 we're sort of relying on, including George's Fill
 11 Site 5/Landfill 4 Remedial Action Plan, and also
 12 the Contingency Plan, which I mentioned earlier.
 13 So if the ARARs issue is not resolved, I think we
 14 are probably close enough on track now that we can
 15 release the Feasibility Study with the revised
 16 ARARs section in it. Otherwise if we weren't able
 17 to do that, we could have just issued the document
 18 for the same section and then if we got the
 19 comments on the ARARs we could just issue it again
 20 because it was sort of tracking separately. And
 21 that takes us to our next point.

22 MS. CHEEVER: We should probably say what
 23 ARARs are.

24 MR. NELSON: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. ARARs
 25 are applicable or relevant and appropriate

1 requirements, which are essentially laws and
 2 regulations that govern environmental protection
 3 and the cleanup process. And CERCLA, the law, says
 4 that you must look at how the cleanup of your site
 5 is going to impact the environment, whether it be
 6 transportation of hazardous materials through a
 7 neighborhood or how you store hazardous wastes when
 8 you're excavating it, or whether or not you have to
 9 wash down a truck and where that washwater goes
 10 before it leaves the site. And there's a variety
 11 of different things, protection of endangered
 12 species, and the like. The wetlands. And there
 13 was a fairly extensive analysis of ARARs that was
 14 done I believe, released to the public (INAUDIBLE)
 15 RAB Agency in August for review. Actually, I
 16 haven't talked to Bob this evening, but we should
 17 be getting comments before Thanksgiving next week.
 18 So DTSC will be weighing in, and we'll be able to
 19 provide some important --

20 MR. O'HARA: Chris, once you get the
 21 comments, what's the next step?

22 MR. NELSON: The comments from the DTSC?

23 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

24 MR. NELSON: It's to revise that section
 25 and make sure that we are complying with their

1 wishes and that (INAUDIBLE). Typical of any other
 2 responsive comment process that we go through. We
 3 make sure we incorporate Bobs' comments, and that
 4 the ARARs section is acceptable to DTSC.

5 MR. O'HARA: Is that then subject to
 6 public comments?

7 MR. NELSON: Yeah. The RAB has the
 8 opportunity to provide comments as well, although I
 9 know one of the things about ARARs is that it has
 10 been sort of a difficult thing to get your arms
 11 around. I know that we've said repeatedly we're
 12 going to have a meeting, and I'm still planning to
 13 do that. I think after having DTSC's comments, we
 14 can look at them and digest them a little bit, and
 15 then we can come together on what some of the
 16 concerns are. One of the desires on the part of
 17 the RAB, and was something that we had talked about
 18 in the past, was to have our attorney and/or
 19 attorneys present at the meeting. So we need to
 20 explore that possibility and see what's amenable to
 21 them.

22 MR. FORD: I think we're planning to do
 23 that, but we need to get a little closer to the end
 24 product, so that we actually have something
 25 meaningful to discuss at that meeting, rather than

1 a document that may still be subject to a lot of
2 revision.

3 MR. NELSON: I think based on comments
4 that I've heard from Bob and perhaps even RAB, that
5 hopefully with these revisions we'll make the
6 section a lot more clear and perhaps a little bit
7 more detailed rather than just having a table of
8 ARARs mentioning a site, what the proposed remedy
9 is from the study and what ARARs apply. Those
10 ARARs would be described in such a way that you
11 would see how that particular regulation, law,
12 statute or whatever, applied to that remedy. It
13 might make it a little bit clearer.

14 MR. PONTON: The Water Board will be
15 making some comments.

16 MR. NELSON: You are. Okay. Will that be
17 coming next?

18 MR. PONTON: Probably not.

19 MR. NELSON: Well, that may have an impact
20 on the final release of the ARARs we'll be making
21 then as we release the -- I was thinking out loud
22 here -- as is without the revised version and take
23 a look at the Water Board comments and incorporate
24 those comments as well. So I want to thank
25 everybody for their patience and hanging in there

1 with the ARARs process. I know it was a long one.
2 But we're going to get through it with all of your
3 appropriate input and comments as we do with
4 everything else.

5 Are there any more questions on ARARs? No.

6 Cleanup Level Document. If you recall, there
7 was a Cleanup Level Document that was put out. It
8 was sort of a companion volume to the Feasibility
9 Study, establishing cleanup levels for soils,
10 sediments, surface water, ground water at the
11 Presidio. And I've spoken with Bob and have his
12 comments in my hand right here. We just received
13 them tonight. So we'll take a look at them, and
14 issue them to the consultant and possibly talk to
15 DTSC if there are any questions so we can be sure
16 we incorporate all their comments. And then once
17 we do that, we can issue the document as final, and
18 any of the cleanups that we do from here on out not
19 related to petroleum but to the CERCLA program,
20 we'll be relying on that Cleanup Level document.

21 MR. BERMAN: Chris, do you expect any
22 comment from EPA on the Cleanup Level document?

23 MR. NELSON: You know, we did issue the
24 document to them for their comments. And I recall,
25 we did have a meeting last year where EPA attended.

1 It's been a sufficient amount of time when we have
2 not heard anything from them. We could solicit
3 comments, but I'm not sure we're going to get them
4 at this point. I think enough time has elapsed
5 that we would have gotten them.

6 MR. BERMAN: Were they sort of delegated
7 (INAUDIBLE) DTSC to be the spokesperson?

8 MR. NELSON: Well, they've sort of done
9 that all together on this process, yeah. I think
10 they like to keep an eye on what was going on to
11 make sure that the process didn't go sideways and
12 that the State was comfortable with what was going
13 on. I think that after the meeting last year and
14 the subsequent meetings on the background metals
15 and such, they must-- and I can't speak for them --
16 there may have been a greater level of comfort that
17 they had. But I recall something that Ned Black
18 had said at that meeting, and that was to have us
19 propose something and have that weigh on it,
20 whether or not we were way off the mark or on
21 track. His essential feedback last year was,
22 "You're on the right track. Give us what you have,
23 and we can comment it." We haven't received any
24 comments.

25 MR. SUTTER: Chris, is there a statutory

1 time limit that EPA has to abide by as far as
2 responding with comments?

3 MR. NELSON: Well, we're not under any
4 type of agreement with EPA, whereas we are with the
5 State agencies. It's not to say that we wouldn't
6 honor any comments we would receive from them or in
7 a public discussion with them. But we don't fund
8 the oversight of EPA for this cleanup. And so I
9 think, to my knowledge, we've only received
10 comments from them on one or two documents in the
11 last two and a half years. Not much.

12 MR. SUTTER: My only question is, do we
13 have to worry about closure with them if we go
14 ahead, and then we hear from them a couple of
15 months later for comment. What does that mean for
16 us?

17 MR. NELSON: I think Bob or Craig would
18 probably speak to the role that EPA and DTSC would
19 play together in such a case. I think the agencies
20 would have to be in disagreement for one of them to
21 usurp the other's decision.

22 MR. COOPER: My understanding is this is a
23 State site, and EPA is basically delegated. We
24 don't plan on intervening or anything, unless
25 asked. Yes. EPA, like Craig says, has an

1 oversight to make sure we're not going too far out
2 of bounds or anything like that. I have made a
3 note to myself to check with Michael Work
4 (PHONETIC). He's the Fed EPA person in charge,
5 just to make sure, so that in case his people --
6 Ned Black is the risk assessor over there -- in
7 case he finds something that our risk assessor
8 missed that's a big smoking gun, but I doubt it.
9 They've worked together. That's why they feel
10 confident in our risk assessors, that sort of
11 thing. So I think as a matter of courtesy, we
12 should just follow up with them to see if they are
13 going to submit comments, but in general, they
14 haven't been.

15 As far as the statutory limit, there
16 can be a statutory limit, but it's easily
17 circumvented by the regulatory agencies. So it's
18 better just to work with us.

19 MR. SUTTER: I'm not trying to create any
20 kind of issue here. I'm just asking a question.
21 That's all. In my career in the past, I've been
22 bit in the butt by one agency coming in after one
23 thought that they had already accepted it. I'm
24 just asking a question.

25 MR. FORD: It's a good point.

1 Our success in that remains to be seen. Anyway,
2 we're currently preparing a scope of work, and that
3 scope of work will direct our consultant to prepare
4 a Field Sampling Plan. Part of that Scope of Work
5 will also include meetings with stakeholders to
6 discuss the strategy of the Sampling Plan to make
7 sure that we're meeting the stakeholders' concerns.
8 We've taken a first step forward with that, and we
9 feel that we're on the right track based on some
10 feedback that we've gotten. So I anticipate being
11 able to release the scope of work to the
12 contractors within the next couple of weeks, and we
13 should get a proposal from them.

14 On the Field Sampling Plan, probably the early
15 part of next year. We've been sidelined by the
16 latest field network we're on, and trying to get
17 back on track with that. The Trust is committed to
18 continuing with this process and getting
19 investigation going. And we appreciate all the
20 comments that we've received from the stakeholders
21 at the last meeting, and we'll be sure to keep you
22 in the loop on the progress.

23 MR. FORD: If I could jump in for a
24 second. There's one thing that I promised to put
25 together at the last meeting that's not come out

1 MR. COOPER: I'm so new to it, I mean, if
2 it's okay with Bob, I'll double-check with the EPA
3 representatives and make sure they're not going to
4 be commenting on this document or subsequent
5 documents, or where is their interest, if any.
6 It's my understanding that there isn't any.

7 MR. BERMAN: Well, I think that they did
8 make a few interesting comments about the quality
9 of some lab work in the past. I think that's been
10 quite useful, but it was more or less informal
11 comments. But I don't think there's ever been any
12 formal document coming from EPA on the cleanup.

13 MR. BOGGS: Not in recent years.

14 MR. NELSON: Any more comments or
15 questions on the cleanup level document?

16 Okay. Last couple of items. Landfill E, which
17 came up at the last RAB meeting. Mark mentioned it
18 was discussed at the RAB Committee Meeting in
19 October. Based on a request from DTSC and repeated
20 discussions with the RAB about Landfill E, the
21 Trust is going to initiate an investigation. We're
22 hoping to kill a few birds with one stone. In
23 other words, we're calling this the last hurrah in
24 terms of investigations, fulfilling both additional
25 characterization and also remedial design criteria.

1 yet. You talked about a list of objectives that we
2 would circulate so that all the various parties
3 could look at the list and see whether their
4 objectives were on there, and if not, bring it up.
5 I have to get on that, and it will be coming out
6 momentarily. We will be sending that around as
7 part of the Planning Documentation for getting this
8 investigation rolling.

9 MR. BERMAN: Presumably you need the
10 objectives, at least in your mind, in order to
11 develop a Sampling Plan request from the
12 contractor.

13 MR. NELSON: That's sort of what we did at
14 the meeting on the 22nd, was to sort of get some
15 ideas and get some discussions going, opening up.
16 We had a consultant there, business subcontractor
17 for EKI, and Holder Associates presented last
18 December on Landfill E. They were discussing the
19 merits of the capping, and what the difference
20 layers of the cap would entail, and also they
21 discussed what sort of data gaps they'd be looking
22 for. And frankly they felt they needed to take a
23 closer look at the data that was there to determine
24 what was really necessary. The State has discussed
25 a need, some geotechnical information about the

1 stability of the site, both within the center of
2 the site as well as at Snoope (PHONETIC) Slope, to
3 the north there.

4 There's also been some concern about landfill
5 gas. How much landfill gas is being generated at
6 the sites? We intend to look at that. There is
7 also the idea of putting in some areas that has not
8 been sampled for chemical analysis. There have
9 been some areas of the site where they had been
10 characterized. We tested bits and logs but no
11 chemical analysis. It might allow us to refine our
12 estimate of the content of hazardous percentages
13 with some additional soil samples. Those are some
14 of the things that we talked about and got some
15 feedback on that. So I think we're heading down
16 the right track. Doug, you can add anything that
17 you'd like.

18 MR. KERN: Well, it's been a long haul to
19 get to this point. I'm really pleased that we're
20 going to be able to develop kind-of a consensus
21 plan around looking at Landfill E, not just with
22 one alternative in mind, but perhaps multiple
23 alternatives. The multiple alternatives have to do
24 with capping versus excavation, and perhaps
25 something in between. So objectives are going to

1 need to include those kinds of things. We like to
2 understand where the previous creek system was, so
3 that if people are able to move down the road
4 towards restoration at some point, there could be
5 some understanding through that investigation. So
6 I'm looking forward to this whole process around
7 Landfill E. I hope we take our time with it and
8 put a lot of effort into it.

9 MS. CHEEVER: You said you were hoping to
10 accomplish a couple of things, both Conditional
11 Characterization Field Sampling and also Remedial
12 Design Criteria. I'm not quite sure how this
13 Conditional Remedial Design Criteria fits in with
14 the selection of the remedy. Does that mean a
15 certain part will be exhumed, or what?

16 MR. NELSON: Well, at this time, the
17 remedies that have been proposed in the Feasibility
18 Study include excavation and capping with a
19 river-style cap. Engineering Commerce is going to
20 be planning a gas collection, groundwater/surface
21 water diversion, et cetera. So based on some input
22 that we've received, if that remedy were to be
23 accepted, that proposal were to be accepted, the
24 State wants to feel a little more comfortable about
25 some of those issues that I mentioned or capping

1 the site. That includes the stability issue and
2 the landfill gas issue. This investigation would
3 answer some of those questions for us, and get us
4 closer to designing that cap, if that is indeed
5 what is to happen. But the Feasibility Study
6 process isn't done, and there's no final decision
7 on a remedy. It's just at this time, we might have
8 to (INAUDIBLE) and that's what we're proposing. It
9 ain't over until it's over, I guess, is the moral
10 of the story.

11 I'd like to wrap up my section so I can leave
12 it for George. My last item is the Public Health
13 Service Hospital Landfills. Based on a request by
14 DTSC, we're conducting an additional
15 characterization investigation and a five-year
16 review of the remedies at the two sites, Public
17 Health Service Hospital Landfills 8 and 10. We
18 received a Work Plan from some consultants in
19 October, and Brian and I reviewed them. We got the
20 comments back, and we're still working out some
21 details on getting the comments responded to
22 appropriately, and when we have a document that we
23 can release, we will. And based on those comments
24 getting incorporated by the stakeholders, we'd like
25 to get in the field next year, or earlier

1 preferably, and do some additional investigations,
2 and complete this five-year review and evaluate the
3 remedies.

4 MR. KERN: I guess about this time last
5 year, we were as committees and sub-committees
6 talking about different sites and different areas.
7 This particular set, 8 and 10, were coming up about
8 that time. So I'm kind of curious about the sense
9 of what kind of investigation is being considered,
10 and whether you might be considering the kinds of
11 things that we were talking about this time last
12 year in the investigation.

13 MR. NELSON: Do you feel comfortable me
14 mentioning what those objectives are? I just want
15 to make sure we're all working from the same sheet
16 of music.

17 The investigation objectives -- We're hoping to
18 find out what is the situation with the seismic
19 stability, geotechnical stability, of Landfill 10.
20 With some plan or desired site changes in the
21 future, primarily implementing some Vegetation
22 Management Plan programs, including extending the
23 habitat of the San Francisco Lasinga (PHONETIC), we
24 are evaluating if sort of a seismically-stable
25 slope would be optimal at Landfill 10. So we'll be

1 collecting some soil samples to determine the
2 engineering properties of soils. And then
3 evaluating, based on the contents of the landfill
4 and the amount of concrete and other debris that's
5 in it, what needs to be done in order to make that
6 slope stable, and also to support vegetation that's
7 planned for that area.

8 A second additional bonus to that would be also
9 that if we had a stable slope, it would be a
10 protected creek resource down-gradient. So there's
11 a protection factor there that's rolled into that.
12 As a result, we would envision some changes to the
13 parking lot, perhaps elimination of a portion of it
14 as we soften that (INAUDIBLE) to allow for some
15 restoration work. We'd have to eliminate some mass
16 there, and probably do a significant amount of
17 regrading to drain the stormwater in the
18 appropriate direction away from the creek.

19 As far as Landfill 8 goes, there is a desire to
20 try and determine more definitively the volume.
21 There's been a question for years whether or not
22 those wings, as we've come to call them, are
23 actually hazardous materials in soil, or whether
24 they're just fill soil or even new soil that was
25 pushed around for grading purposes. So they're

1 being looked at, those soils on the wings. And
2 then also there were some areas around the presumed
3 perimeter of the landfill that the Army had to find
4 that needs some additional testing. So we're doing
5 some testing there. And then also some test pits
6 from the middle. So we will get a pretty good
7 idea, based on the same methodology that was used
8 in the Feasibility Study of EPI to estimate the
9 volume, and also be able to figure out how much
10 soil, how much debris, how much hazardous waste, et
11 cetera.

12 The Five-Year Review itself, we'll be looking
13 at the performance of the remedies, and after five
14 years, has the groundwater actually shown any
15 impacts, or is it tended to stabilize, (INAUDIBLE)
16 et cetera, and that sort of thing.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Previously, didn't the Army
18 have a record of a decision that about two years
19 ago the Trust was talking about reopening that? Is
20 the Five-Year Review a review of the Army's
21 recommended decision?

22 MR. NELSON: Yes, it is.

23 MS. CHEEVER: So now you're not using the
24 language of saying reopening that. But is that
25 something that is still on the table, following

1 this look at what the investigation produces, or --

2 MR. NELSON: I think we need to evaluate
3 that possibility, and we need to see what the
4 outcome of the investigations are, and we need to
5 see where the State is (INAUDIBLE) stakeholders.
6 We received some direction that a ROD was not
7 necessary, but a five-year review may answer that
8 question more definitively than just a letter from
9 the Agency. So that's kind of a long yes, I guess.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Was that direction then from
11 DTSC?

12 MR. NELSON: Yes.

13 MR. BOGGS: It's actually a regulatory
14 requirement that they do that after five years,
15 recommending a remedy. It's just a check to make
16 sure the remedy's working and that sort of thing.
17 There's different levels of those reviews. They're
18 kind of doing between the first and second tier of
19 the Five-Year Review.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Does that have the same
21 result as possibly reopening the decision, or is it
22 a less definite step than what we were talking
23 about a year or two ago?

24 MR. BOGGS: Well, a year or two ago, they
25 were talking about opening the ROD. And DTSC

1 wasn't too favorable of that; i.e, for us to go
2 back and change a legal decision in our department,
3 we have to see something significant that the
4 remedies changed. So far, we haven't seen that the
5 remedy really needs to change. But, like you said,
6 this Five-Year Review will hopefully tell us that
7 something needs to change without the remedy or it
8 won't, and then if something needs to change, yes,
9 we'll go change the ROD and put in the remedy. And
10 if not, we just keep moving forward, and then in
11 another five years, we'll check again to make sure
12 the remedy is still working.

13 MR. NELSON: Thanks for that input, Bob.
14 If there are no more questions for me, I'd like to
15 hand the floor over to George Ford.

16 MR. FORD: Okay. I'll just start going
17 through the slides here, and stop me if you have
18 any questions.

19 On the Master Schedule, we sent in a draft
20 submittal to DTSC on the second of October. We met
21 and discussed it on the 16th, and we expect the
22 schedule will probably also be a major topic of
23 discussion at the bimonthly meeting, which is
24 happening next Tuesday, a week from today in the
25 daytime. I think it starts at 10:00, at Building

1 1750.

2 The Master Schedule, I think, should be
3 considered a work in progress. We're moving the
4 big pieces around to accommodate the needs of both
5 the Trust and the Park Service, and I expect as we
6 go through the scheduling process, we'll be finding
7 that other people have requirements that we need to
8 accommodate on our schedule. So we're working on
9 that. If you have strong opinions about it, you
10 might want to come next Tuesday morning. Next
11 slide please.

12 Okay. Groundwater Monitoring Program. I'm not
13 sure this slide got updated. Well, I guess part of
14 it did, but part of it didn't. The 2nd quarter
15 Revised Draft Sampling Report actually came back
16 from the Park Service on the 23rd of October. So
17 the Trust sent it back to the consultant, who I
18 believe is now wrestling with it and trying to get
19 it into final format so that it can be released for
20 everybody to review.

21 Table 1, which is the means by which we -- sort
22 of a simple table that includes anything that we're
23 proposing to change for the next round of
24 groundwater sampling. It's supposed to come out
25 this week. So you should be seeing it momentarily.

1 The next round of sampling begins two weeks
2 from yesterday. The groundwater is moving along
3 slowly. We're still getting these first few
4 reports, quarterly reports out. It's been like
5 pulling teeth. We hope that as the consultant and
6 the Trust and the Park Service all get on the same
7 page that we will be able to turn them out a little
8 more quickly in the future. I think the
9 information is more relevant -- You know, the
10 sooner you can get it, the better off it is. We
11 recognize that it's taken a long time. We need to
12 get these things going. We hope that we'll be able
13 to produce them more quickly in the future.

14 MR. BERMAN: Is there any suggestion that
15 you need to dig more wells?

16 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I
17 don't think -- I mean, we have specific sites where
18 we know we have wells that we want to remove or
19 replace or add to, but I don't really think there's
20 a global evaluation for --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. The interpretation
22 and presentation data don't go into such detail,
23 but it's set up so that someone could then do that
24 sort of analysis.

25 MR. BERMAN: Right. But my question

1 really is, is there a suggestion from looking at
2 that data that new wells are needed, or is it too
3 early at this time?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't know that
5 anyone's done that. I know when the report comes
6 out, we can all review that. In my review, nothing
7 jumps out as obvious. I don't recall that there
8 was anything that was significantly different on a
9 (INAUDIBLE) basis, per site in the past. Or if
10 there were, those were differences that were
11 already being addressed.

12 MR. BERMAN: Just on an informational
13 level, is there a Presidio-wide map with all the
14 wells marked on it that will be available for us to
15 look at?

16 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I
17 don't think I've seen a single one that has all the
18 wells.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I have seen one. I'm not
20 sure if it's in the report though.

21 MR. NELSON: If you could get your hands
22 on the Army's monitoring plan -- no?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not the Army's plan.

24 MR. FORD: We'll get you one of those. It
25 seems like that's a tool that we ought to have.

1 We'll get something put together.

2 MR. BERMAN: It would be kind-of useful to
3 look at when you're talking about the report, in
4 advance --

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's fairly large.

6 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the things that we
8 did to improve them, one is, compared to this
9 report that's coming out compared to what the Army
10 did, there are area interpretations and
11 preservations, so that adjacent sites were shown on
12 the same (INAUDIBLE), whereas the Army had them on
13 separate maps. And here you could begin to see how
14 sites may -- as you look -- the sites don't
15 (INAUDIBLE) probably water does seem to flow
16 between certain sites. And when you look at whole
17 areas of the Presidio and see if it bends
18 essentially in terms of (INAUDIBLE), and that does
19 change interpretations compared to where you can
20 (INAUDIBLE). So in that regard, it does
21 significantly help to look at the area, with a
22 chance to see all of them, looking up from another
23 part of it and see all those sites at once.

24 MR. O'HARA: Do you have any idea when the
25 report will be coming out?

1 MR. FORD: No, I don't. I can find out
2 and call you. Jan Coates is handling that, and I
3 neglected to ask her this afternoon, but I'll find
4 out and let you know. Other questions about
5 groundwater? If you think of something as we go
6 along, we can come back to it.

7 LAIR. For those of you who don't love it as
8 much as I do, LAIR stands for Letterman Army
9 Institute of Research, which a month ago I knew
10 very little about, and now I know a little bit more
11 about it.

12 As you may recall, last month we discussed this
13 at the RAB, and you collectively showed some
14 interest in making sure that there were no
15 surprises that would come from a demolition of
16 LAIR. We heard you. And so we've been digging
17 into it, metaphorically speaking, since then. We
18 have not been digging into it literally. The
19 structure of the LAIR is essentially gone. I think
20 there is a portion of what used to be the library
21 left standing. They're in the process of bringing
22 that down. What they have done is bring the
23 building down into the basement. Those are now
24 filled up with the blackened rubble from the
25 portion that was above-ground. And the contractor

1 will shortly begin removing the blown rubble from
2 the basement shoveling it out, and then at some
3 point later this months or in early December they
4 will get to the point where they need to look at
5 removing the basement walls and the basement
6 floors. What the Trust has committed to do is get
7 -- we've tried to put together an Investigation
8 Plan that covers possible contingencies as far as
9 leaks from the sanitary sewage that are below the
10 basement floor. And actually I only brought 20
11 copies, and I have no explanation why I only
12 brought 20. Anybody who is interested is welcome
13 to take a copy of this Investigation Plan. This is
14 something that the Trust put together. We sent it
15 to DTSC and they're reviewing it. Bob and I have
16 had some discussions, and Bob's been out to the
17 site. Basically it consists of two things: There
18 is a proposed Sampling and Analysis Program.
19 Basically what the Trust is proposing to do is to
20 inspect the sewage trenches as the sewages are
21 being removed for any signs of leakage. We think
22 that because they are sanitary sewers, if they did
23 leak, we'll be able to see it. I can vouch for the
24 fact, having looked at a lot of other sanitary
25 sewers, we dig up in the course of our business

1 when sanitary sewers look -- Normally, there's
2 visual evidence. But you could get some signs of
3 staining in the soil. What we're proposing to do
4 is to observe as the sanitary sewers are removed,
5 and any place that we observe any visible evidence
6 of contamination, we cover it right back up.

7 Knowing DTSC and other regulatory agencies, I
8 think there's probably a reasonable chance that
9 DTSC will actually be on site while this work is
10 being done. So the notification may consist of my
11 looking at that. Once we identify something, we
12 might uncover a backup. And then maybe (INAUDIBLE)
13 to sample it through the cover, whether the cover
14 is plastic or soiled.

15 We conduct our operation such that we'd be able
16 to immediately recover anything that is exposed.
17 The soil samples would then be analyzed for a list
18 of analytes that we have proposed that's also
19 described in this document, plus anything else that
20 the Army advises us that we should analyze for.

21 And the second part of this document is that
22 we sent a letter to the Army, also in late October,
23 asking their assistance. We asked them to review
24 the analyte list that we proposed, which is
25 basically a fairly complete suite of organic and

1 inorganic chemicals. We've asked them to review
2 this list and advise us either that it is
3 appropriate to detect anything that may have been
4 used at LAIR, or if it is not sufficient to detect
5 anything they used at LAIR, to advise us what
6 should be added. And what we've also asked is if
7 there's anything that we should test for at LAIR,
8 that for which tests are not commercially available
9 at commercial labs, that they would advise us about
10 that and also assist us.

11 We've been in contact with the Army since we
12 sent this request for help, and I know we haven't
13 received a response from them yet. I have been
14 told that they will respond.

15 One of our concerns was the Army is fighting a
16 war right now, and this kind of a request, while
17 it's very important to all of us who are here, it
18 may not be a Priority One item in Washington, D.C.

19 But we do have some movement. We know that
20 people in the Pentagon are discussing this, and
21 they have made it clear that they would respond to
22 us. We don't have a date for -- a date certain by
23 which they will respond, but we are pressing them
24 and explaining to them the urgency of getting their
25 input on this issue before it comes time to do the

1 basement excavation.

2 MR. SUTTER: A timeframe is included in
3 all this?

4 MR. FORD: We haven't asked them
5 specifically. If you look at this, it's more of a
6 request.

7 MR. SUTTER: I was just making an aside.

8 MR. FORD: There's actually an interesting
9 article about New York, about the Anthrax strain.
10 Of course, now everyone's interested in this, and
11 the people who found it in Iowa, about a month ago,
12 destroyed all of their remaining samples. This is
13 unbelievable, just as this becomes a huge issue to
14 millions of people. They cooked all the bugs and
15 killed them all. They didn't ask me.

16 MR. O'HARA: Would you undertake any kind
17 of testing or start to remove soil over the sewer
18 line prior to the time the Army responds to you?

19 MR. FORD: No. We're going to get a
20 response from the Army. We're also doing our own
21 research into what kinds of tests are available,
22 and what it would make sense to do. What we're
23 trying to do is proceed on two fronts. We are
24 asking the Army, "Is there anything that we should
25 be concerned about here? And if there is, please

1 advise us how we should handle it." But we're also
2 doing our own research to try to make sure we
3 understand -- If we find the Army's answer less
4 than completely satisfactory, we want to have our
5 own Contingency Plan. Essentially we want to have
6 our own program in mind.

7 MR. O'HARA: Do your resources include
8 people who are technically qualified to give you
9 advice on biohazards?

10 MR. FORD: At this point, I would say no,
11 but we're just getting into that part of it. So by
12 the time we get to the point where we're exposing
13 any soil, we will have collected that advice.

14 I should point out in my research about the
15 history of LAIR, the Army has consistently denied
16 that they used or that they did any biological
17 weapons research there. And I think their denials
18 are consistent with the history of US policy in
19 that area. So the Army's official position in the
20 past has been that they didn't do any chemical
21 warfare research, and they didn't do any biological
22 warfare agent research there, and when they
23 decommissioned the buildings in '93 and '94, that
24 they followed all the protocols for decommissioning
25 a hospital building that were then in force. And

1 to the extent that I can tell from my research,
2 they did have a radionuclide issue there, and they
3 did have to do a fair amount of cleanup in some of
4 their laboratories, including taking furniture out
5 and cleaning walls and removing some surfaces.

6 Essentially the Army acknowledged that they
7 used radioactive materials there. They did a
8 screening for it. They found some inside the
9 building, and they went through a removal process,
10 and they actually commissioned a division of the
11 Oakridge Research Laboratory to come in and confirm
12 that what they had done was correct. So they did a
13 radioactive materials issue there, but I think the
14 documentation is fairly thorough that they took
15 care of that. But so far their position has been
16 that they didn't do any bio-weapon or chemical
17 weapon research there.

18 MR. SUTTER: Well, what did they find? I
19 have some inside sources, (INAUDIBLE) defensive bio
20 and chemical research.

21 MR. FORD: We haven't got anything
22 official back from them. I hate to tell you to
23 hurry up and wait, but I think at this point what
24 we've got to do is wait for the Army's response and
25 see what it is.

1 MR. O'HARA: What is your timetable?

2 MR. FORD: Well, my timetable is to bang
3 on the Army a couple times a week to make sure that
4 they understand that we need this soon. I don't
5 know what the precise demolition schedule is. I
6 believe I have roughly a couple more weeks before
7 this issue is going to affect the demolition
8 schedule. But that's essentially the schedule I'm
9 working on. I need to have a response from the
10 Army within the next two weeks.

11 MR. O'HARA: And your own investigative
12 work is parallel and not going out to alternative
13 resources?

14 MR. FORD: Yes. As far as where that
15 goes, it's somewhat dependant on what the Army
16 tells us. We really -- what it boils down to is,
17 we've got to get some kind of response from the
18 Army and take a look at it and see what they've
19 told us. Because their response could fit anywhere
20 in the spectrum from a one-sentence response
21 saying, "We told you we never did it. Now leave us
22 alone," to something more elaborate that actually
23 does include analytical protocols.

24 MR. O'HARA: What would your course of
25 action be if you get the one sentence response?

1 MR. FORD: It's a tough one to do that
2 what-if. But basically, what we'd be looking at is
3 finalizing our own program of analysis. We would
4 do that before any of these soils are exposed. As
5 to what exactly would be in the sampling protocol,
6 Right now, I don't know. We're still doing that
7 research. But we would have something in place.
8 It would have been submitted to DTSC and approved
9 by them before the floors come up.

10 MR. O'HARA: Bob, in your take on this, do
11 you have the same anxieties that neighborhood
12 groups do, and to what extent is the State prepared
13 to insist on support of our concerns? Not that you
14 wouldn't. I want to get a feeling of how the State
15 feels about this.

16 MR. BOGGS: I know there's a lot of
17 concern at my Agency. In fact, we're the ones that
18 directed the Trust to put the Sampling Plan
19 together. They would have put forth the notion
20 that two sampling rounds have been done. Typically
21 that would be sufficient for us to say, "Okay.
22 Yeah. Go do your work."

23 Because of the history, we do have special
24 concern for Letterman and LAIR in particular. I've
25 been directed to do some homework on my own, and

1 I've also found a few little things here and there,
2 things that have been used, etc, that may have been
3 of concern.

4 So there is a lot of concern at our Agency.
5 There's been concern to the extent of, we have a
6 retired military personnel lined up, that if we
7 need somebody with security clearance to know
8 through the Army what was used there, we can take
9 that route. My boss is very key on getting the
10 Army to document what we need to be concerned about
11 or not concerned about. Beyond what they tell us,
12 we don't have a lot of mechanisms to drag them into
13 court or anything, or to call them. We don't have
14 any information to call them liars either.

15 I think what our position is we have a fairly
16 extensive Sampling Plan being proposed by the
17 Trust. We remember looking at a lot of things. We
18 have some comments. We wanted to look at some
19 other things in addition to the sewers, any place
20 that could have been a concern. But we really do
21 want to get some assurance from the Army that none
22 of these things that we wouldn't commonly find we
23 needn't be worried about.

24 My boss' position on this goes to the extent
25 they can't start construction of anything new there

1 until the environmental stuff is cleared by this
2 Agency. And so he's very clear that before they
3 start constructing the campus, so to speak, we will
4 have covered potential environmental concerns.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Where does sewer go? If
6 anything ever was put into the sewer that shouldn't
7 have been, is it already gone to some place where
8 it shouldn't be?

9 MR. FORD: The answer is, if they did, it
10 has, and it happened a long time ago.

11 MR. ANDERSON: And where does it go?

12 MR. FORD: Basically, it heads northward.
13 There are several trunk sewers that all meet kind
14 of down near the driveway into the Letterman
15 Complex on Gorgas Street, which is the north end,
16 sort of the bay end of the site. The sewers all
17 come together and go out into a main sanitary sewer
18 which I believe -- and Tom, you can jump in if I
19 get the plumbing wrong -- it goes into a force main
20 where the sewage is actually pumped from a
21 collection point there through the municipal sewer
22 system, and it eventually goes --

23 MR. ANDERSON: The San Francisco Municipal
24 Sewer System?

25 MR. FORD: The San Francisco Municipal

1 Sewer System. And sewage from that area goes to
2 the treatment plant that is -- is it Northpoint --
3 okay. And there it's treated. Is there an outfall
4 off of Northpoint, or do they send it around on
5 Beach --

6 MR. KERN: It goes to the Southeast
7 Treatment Plant.

8 MR. FORD: Southeast? Okay.

9 MR. KERN: Northpoint is a wet-weather
10 flow only. It's not a sewage treatment.

11 MR. FORD: Well, we'll have to get a
12 little clearer on the details of the San Francisco
13 Sanitary plumbing system, but it's something to
14 keep in mind. The Army completely vacated LAIR by
15 1995. They started vacating it in '93, and it was
16 completely gone by '95. So whatever they were
17 doing hasn't been done there for at least six
18 years. If they did dispose of things down sanitary
19 sewers, in all likelihood they were flushed down
20 the sewers, so to speak, and sent out to the San
21 Francisco Treatment Plant, and subjected to the
22 normal sewage treatment when it discharged.

23 MR. ANDERSON: What's the likelihood that
24 they would be there at this time?

25 MR. FORD: Off the top of my head, I would

1 say the likelihood is very low but again --

2 MR. ANDERSON: And what about it's being
3 somewhere else, not in the sewer, but in the
4 material (INAUDIBLE).

5 MR. FORD: That's what our Sampling Plan
6 is designed to really look at, if there was a
7 release of any kind from the sewer.

8 MR. ANDERSON: No. What about the
9 building itself that you're in the process of
10 knocking down?

11 MR. FORD: I'd say it's more in past
12 tense. The building is pretty much knocked down.

13 MR. ANDERSON: (INAUDIBLE) rubble.

14 MR. FORD: Right.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Is there any possibility
16 that some agent might be just a part of that
17 rubble?

18 MR. FORD: Well, the buildings were pretty
19 thoroughly cleaned out between what the Army did,
20 and the Trust has gone through multiple rounds of
21 salvaging.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Is there a possibility of
23 contaminated materials? You can take everything
24 out of the room, but the room's still there. I
25 don't know. I'm just wondering.

1 MR. FORD: I don't know. I can tell you
2 that dozens to hundreds of abatement and salvage
3 workers have gone in and out of buildings for
4 months before the demolition started, and as far as
5 we know, there hasn't been any outbreaks of disease
6 traceable back to the site.

7 So I guess I don't really know the answer to
8 your question. I hope that the Army will be able
9 to show that they did a proper job of cleaning up
10 after themselves for materials besides -- I think
11 it's pretty clear they did do a proper job of
12 cleaning up after themselves as far as radioactive
13 materials. There's a clear record about that.
14 What we don't have right at the moment is a clear
15 record of what they did to clean up after
16 themselves as far as biohazards go.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Finally, how far do you
18 dismantle the sewer system, and how do you close it
19 off?

20 MR. FORD: Well, the demolition contract
21 requires that we essentially remove it all,
22 potentially back to a -- it's kind-of like a big
23 manhole collection point where several trunk sewers
24 come in. And that is close to the north edge of
25 the property. So our plan is --

1 MR. ANDERSON: North edge of Letterman?

2 MR. FORD: Yes, on the south side of
3 Gorgas Street.

4 MR. SUTTER: Although the Army has been
5 obviously going since '95, I thought they stopped
6 using Letterman and LAIR 20 years before that even.
7 I thought they hadn't used it since the 70's.

8 MR. FORD: No. Actually, LAIR itself was
9 constructed in phases between '72 and '76. It
10 didn't exist until the early to mid-70's.

11 MR. SUTTER: When did they last use it; do
12 you know?

13 MR. FORD: Well, the last time that they
14 -- it was fully occupied -- was early in 1993, I
15 believe. And then they started phasing out and
16 leaving it. And essentially by the end of 1993, I
17 think the Army was completely out of it. The US
18 Department of Agriculture remained there through
19 '94 and a portion of 1995, and they were using some
20 laboratory space essentially loaned to them by the
21 Army. But then nobody's been in there. There has
22 been no active research there since 1995.

23 MR. SUTTER: Yes. I was curious about the
24 demolition process. Are you going to be able to
25 demolish the basements, the sub-basements in a way

1 such that you can identify sections of sewer lines
2 that might have been cracked in the past? Are you
3 going to be able to do it so surgically that you
4 will be able to distinguish between an old cracked
5 section of the sewer or section of the sewer that's
6 damaged by the demolition?

7 MR. FORD: Well, I'd have to think about
8 that, but off the top of my head, I think the
9 answer is yes, that we will be able to distinguish
10 just because the through-put on the sanitary sewers
11 has been minimal in the last six years, and it's
12 been zero recently. So I would expect that we
13 ought to be able to -- I'm going to expect that old
14 breaks, you're going to see staining of the soil,
15 and you'll probably see staining of the edges of
16 the break. Kind of how you can sometimes tell with
17 a car? If there's a scrape on it and it's full of
18 rust, you know that it happened a long time ago.
19 But if it's fresh, you know that it's happened
20 recently. I would expect that we would be able to
21 make some judgments about the age of the breaks.

22 I think the other thing is that we are going to
23 have to exert some control over the demolition
24 operation. We're having discussions about that in
25 the Trust right now as to whether we will use the

1 demolition contractor to do this work, or whether
2 we will bring in a more specialized contractor.
3 The fact is, it will have to be done in such a
4 fashion that we can track the sewers from where
5 they exit the building, all the way back down the
6 line.

7 MR. SUTTER: I just had visions of the
8 demo contractors coming in and everything goes in
9 two hours.

10 MR. FORD: I'm sure that's exactly how
11 they'd like to do it. We're not going to let them
12 do it that way.

13 MR. BERMAN: In your investigations, do
14 you think that the Army -- At one time there was a
15 suspicion that they had a bevy of primates doing
16 various types of medical investigations.

17 MR. FORD: Yeah, they did. I know. I've
18 seen an inventory where they had 300 primates in
19 1989, I believe. The Army concedes that they had
20 300 primates in LAIR at the time that they did the
21 inventory.

22 MR. BERMAN: If I could just emphasize
23 what Peter was saying. It's likely that some type
24 of defensive and biological research was going on.
25 It's hard to figure out why they would have all of

1 that George is working with a fluid situation.
2 He's clearly getting input from people. I just
3 don't want to have a discussion that just goes on
4 and on and on. So if people have specific
5 requests, or questions, then George can say, "Okay,
6 I'll take that in," or, "Yes, I don't know," but
7 let's try to keep it focused on things that he can
8 actually use, and that will give you some kind of a
9 comfort level. And then we need to give our
10 reporter a break soon. Any other questions or
11 concerns on LAIR at this point?

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How will you update us
13 on what you find out from the Army?

14 MR. FORD: Well, I think what we've been
15 doing, Peter and I have had some Email
16 correspondence, and I think I've cc'd a few of you,
17 but since there is a great level of interest on the
18 Army's response, I would suggest that we Email it
19 around. Although now that I suggest that, I
20 probably will not get an electronic file from the
21 Army. I'm going to get a hard copy. I guess maybe
22 we'll scan it, and sent it around as a Jaypaig
23 (PHONETIC), and if it's 12 pages single-spaced,
24 what we'll do is read through it and try to provide
25 a bullet synopsis of what it actually says. I hope

1 those primates in there without something that
2 relates to a biological research program. And of
3 course, it's highly classified material because of
4 the political statements that have been made in the
5 past. So just as an amateur, it's very difficult
6 to think that they would have primate population
7 without doing some kind of biological/weapon
8 investigations.

9 MR. FORD: Well, and that's why -- What
10 we're trying to do it is strike a balance here. So
11 far, there is no evidence of any problems so far.

12 MR. BERMAN: There might not be a problem,
13 but it's just that the Army has said that they
14 didn't do that kind of work -- well, they didn't do
15 biological/weapon work there. What in the world
16 was 300 primates doing there?

17 MR. FORD: Three pigs, 2000 mice, animal
18 stories. Animal inventory was --

19 MR. BERMAN: That was a big activity at
20 LAIR. They had a lot of biologists there at the
21 time, too.

22 MR. KERN: I'd like to jump in here.
23 We've carrying this conversation a little bit far,
24 which is fine. It's obviously an important topic.
25 I would like to say it's my own view at the moment

1 that the next thing that I can get from the Army is
2 a commitment as to what date they will respond by.
3 That tells me whether I have a small problem or a
4 huge problem. We will plan on circulating it by
5 Email. If anybody can't get Email, either let me
6 know or Craig or Jane or Chris, and we'll figure
7 out another way to get it to you.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Has anyone contacted
9 Fineston or Pelosi? No. We've talked about that,
10 but my thinking on this -- I can't speak for the
11 whole Trust, but the idea was we want to give the
12 Army an opportunity to do the right thing before we
13 hit them over the head with a sledgehammer. And so
14 I think I see it as we're kind-of in that phase.

15 The initial indications are pretty good. I
16 was worried that the Army would just stonewall us
17 and not respond at all. They're not doing that.
18 They have made it clear that they will respond, and
19 that they are considering or researching. So I'm
20 hopeful that we will get a response that is
21 something more than one sentence.

22 (Break taken)

23 MR. FORD: Okay. So I guess we'll dive
24 back into Mountain Lake, so to speak. Normally I
25 can resist. But I'm sorry about that. DTSC sent

1 their first letter out on September 28th. My
2 understanding is they still haven't heard from
3 Caltrans. Has that changed in the last few days?

4 MR. BOGGS: No, that's correct. Our
5 lawyer is looking at the next step, which would
6 have normally been a Compliance Order.

7 MR. ANDERSON: To whom?

8 MR. BOGGS: To Caltrans, but they're not
9 real comfortable writing an order from one State
10 agency to another State agency. But our lawyer is
11 working on that.

12 MR. FORD: We'll just kind-of have to wait
13 and see. The hope is to get all the parties to a
14 table before the end of the year, to at least
15 discuss what the next step is.

16 MR. ANDERSON: And what are PRPs?

17 MR. FORD: Potentially responsible
18 parties, parties that have liability (INAUDIBLE).
19 Which I think for Mountain Lake, the PRPs are
20 considered to be the Trust, the Army, and Caltrans,
21 although my guess is that Caltrans and the Army
22 will both have theories about why they have PRPs.

23 MR. ANDERSON: You have a theory too,
24 don't you?

25 MR. FORD: Yes, I have a theory that they

1 marsh.

2 And we're also having a consultant put together
3 a work plan for the Commissary, the Post Exchange
4 site. And this is the overall site. We did a
5 cleanup in one corner of it earlier this year.

6 We're getting ready to take a look at the overall
7 property, and also a work plan for Building 1349.

8 MR. BOGGS: IP put together a work plan
9 for the Commissary a couple years when you were
10 here. Is that being used to put this one together?

11 MR. FORD: Yes. Basically, we used that
12 as a base for them to start. I instructed them to
13 build off of that, but also consider that they have
14 a blank piece of paper, and if after they reviewed
15 all the data, if they felt there were things that
16 should be done differently than IT was proposing to
17 do it, then I wanted the updated look.

18 So Treadmill and Rollo is doing that for us. I
19 don't know the precise schedule is, but I would say
20 roughly within two to three months we should have a
21 Work Plan coming out that you can look at. Those
22 of you who know the history of the commissary and
23 the PX area, that should be an exciting one to
24 investigate because the Army did all kind of --
25 every kind of vehicle maintenance or fueling or

1 are both guilty and they should bring money to the
2 first meeting. I don't think they will. And I
3 think people should expect this is going to be a
4 possess, trying to negotiate a three-way or
5 four-way negotiation (INAUDIBLE) DTSC, between
6 three PRPs and a regulatory agency. It's going to
7 take some time to clearly define the
8 responsibilities. I wouldn't look for a resolution
9 of the issue of who's paying early next year. It's
10 going to take awhile.

11 Next slide, the Building 1065 Corrective Action
12 Plan. Harding ESE are consultants who put together
13 a Work Plan to address the data gaps in the 1065
14 Petroleum Cleanup area. And we have been wrestling
15 with that. It appears to be in good shape, and
16 expect to mail it to the agencies and the RAB next
17 week. So you'll know when it arrives. It's about
18 three-and-a-half inches thick.

19 The Trust is getting additional studies for
20 future Corrective Action Plans going. We either
21 have issued or will momentarily issue purchase
22 orders to do additional characterization in the
23 207/231 Corrective Action Plan area, which also
24 happens to be right smack on top of the Tennessee
25 Hollow riparian corridor where it come down to the

1 tank car unloading, they did it down there. I
2 think it will be an interesting site to
3 investigate.

4 Building 1349 we think will be a fairly small
5 simple Corrective Action Plan. 1349 was a former
6 heating oil storage tank that is right across the
7 street from Fill Site 5. The tank's gone now. The
8 Army did a pretty substantial cleanup on the actual
9 site of the tank, but they didn't chase out all the
10 various odds and ends off the property. So the
11 1349 Corrective Action will be to chase down those
12 little fingers that are extended off the site.

13 MR. O'HARA: Is that the water (INAUDIBLE)
14 on top of --

15 MR. FORD: Yes. In that triangle between
16 Colby and Harrison and Washington.

17 MR. O'HARA: That 40,000 gallon?

18 MR. FORD: Yes. That's the one. As we
19 get this Corrective Action Plan going, we hope that
20 will be kind-of the final. We'll fix up everything
21 up there on top of the hill between Landfill 4 and
22 Fill Site 5 and the 1349 Petroleum.

23 And these will be spaced out. I'm kind-of
24 mentioning them all now because we are going
25 through our contracting process, but we're not

Page 69

1 going to dump all of these Corrective Draft Plans
2 for you to review in January. We're going to be
3 spacing them out over the next year to a year and a
4 half. We'll try to have them come out with
5 reasonable spacing between them so people can look
6 at them without being overwhelmed with the volume
7 of paper.

8 There are some smaller things happening in the
9 petroleum program. We are getting ready to do some
10 digging at very small mini-cap site on Liggett
11 Avenue and Lower Simonds. These are areas where
12 the Army removed small heating oil, 500-gallon
13 heating oil tanks at individual residential units,
14 and where they cleaned up most of the petroleum but
15 they didn't quite get it all. We are trying to go
16 back and finish those off.

17 Also, we have a hydraulic cylinder that we
18 discovered some months ago in the floor of Building
19 1937, which is one of the former airplane hangers
20 down at the west end of Crissy Field, and that will
21 be removed later this week.

22 The fun discovery that we had last week -- bad
23 fun -- we found a large fuel distribution system
24 tank at the dust bowl. The dust bowl is that big
25 valley. It's kind of a round valley that is

Page 70

1 bounded by the YMCA and Lincoln Boulevard and
2 Presidio Boulevard. Sort of a big pit with a tank
3 bottom. The Trust was planting some trees there
4 last week, full-size trees that have been taken off
5 of the Letterman Site, and right where they dug a
6 hole to put in one of these Italian Stone pines,
7 they found a tank. There is no record of any fuel
8 distribution system lines crossing there or any
9 tanks.

10 But we've looked at air photos. It appears
11 there was a building in that corner of the dust
12 bowl through at least the early 60's. We don't
13 know what the building was used for. But it's
14 pretty clear that this heating oil tank was there
15 as a terminal storage tank to feed the furnace. It
16 looks like it's about a 2000-gallon tank, so it's a
17 fairly good size. And we will be removing that as
18 soon as we can.

19 We should be removing it right now, but we've
20 run into a situation with the City of San
21 Francisco. We do tank removals under a permit from
22 the City of San Francisco. We go apply for one.
23 Apparently, they used to have two or three
24 inspectors who would come out to observe these tank
25 removals, but apparently the inspectors they had

Page 71

1 have all gone on to other responsibilities, and
2 they have one part-time fireman who works two days
3 a week doing the tank removals. And so actually
4 getting on the schedule just to have the guy come
5 out and oversee the removal is becoming a big
6 issue.

7 We will see how that goes. If it turns out
8 that the city's inability to provide an inspector
9 becomes a huge issue for our petroleum schedule,
10 we'll have to figure out another way. But for the
11 time being, we're trying to go on the schedule for
12 one guy who works two days a week.

13 MR. O'HARA: Are there other jurisdictions
14 you could go to to get inspectors?

15 MR. FORD: I don't think so. I believe
16 what the Army did -- If we run into a jam with
17 these inspectors, we'll probably look at doing
18 something like what the Army did, which was
19 essentially -- if I paraphrase this wrong, jump in
20 Brian -- I think the Army essentially proposed to
21 the Water Board that the Army would oversee their
22 own tank removals. They would do it in accordance
23 with the standards that the City would ask for
24 because the stuff that the City wants is pretty
25 basic, and it's stuff that we would do anyway. So

Page 72

1 in some sense, we really don't need an inspector
2 there looking over our shoulder because they're
3 just there to confirm that we're doing all the
4 stuff we're going to do anyway.

5 So what we would probably do is write a letter
6 to the Water Board and propose that we oversee our
7 own tank removals, and we'd have some conditions
8 that if we found any leaks -- See, if you're
9 removing a tank under San Francisco oversight, if
10 it comes out clean, then you send a report to the
11 city of San Francisco, and theoretically you're
12 done. If the tank leaks, if there's any evidence
13 of leakage, the City refers you to the Water Board
14 immediately for follow up as a leak case. So we'd
15 probably do something like that. We would approach
16 the Water Board and discuss whether we can come up
17 with some kind of compromise oversight,
18 self-oversight or have consultants oversee the work
19 that we do or something. Because to me, it doesn't
20 make sense, once we've geared up to do the tank
21 removal, to have to space it out and take five
22 years to do one year's worth of work because we
23 can't get City inspectors --

24 MR. O'HARA: If somebody's qualified to
25 inspect tanks in Sausalito or San Rafael or San

1 Francisco or San Mateo, and if somebody has got
2 that qualification, why rely on San Francisco if
3 they're dragging their feet? Bring somebody else
4 in as a third party.

5 MR. FORD: The Trust has a policy that we
6 are trying to be a good neighbor with San
7 Francisco.

8 MR. O'HARA: Is San Francisco trying to be
9 a good neighbor to the Trust?

10 MR. FORD: I think our official position
11 is, yes, they are. What I'd like to do is see how
12 it goes. It may turn out, if there aren't a lot of
13 tank removals going on over the City, maybe we can
14 monopolize the inspector's time. Two days a week
15 we could get most of that done. That's more than
16 enough. So what I would propose to do is, let's
17 give it a month or two and kind-of see how it goes.
18 And I'll report back.

19 If we are suffering unacceptable delays because
20 they can't send an inspector, I'll be looking for
21 Plan B. And at the moment, I don't know what it
22 is, but I can tell you that we will come up with a
23 plan.

24 MR. SUTTER: You've got a couple of months
25 on this, George?

1 rather than slow down.

2 We are still wrestling with the mini-CAP draft
3 work plan. These are big mini-CAPs, Building 42
4 and Buildings 100 to 104. Those are the big
5 historic brick barracks. Those are quite a bit
6 different than the projects we started on Liggett
7 Avenue and Lower Simonds, so we hope we're in the
8 final round of revision of that Work Plan so we can
9 see the light of day. But I'm not going to predict
10 a date because I have been wrong on this project
11 about a half a dozen times already. We've had a
12 lot of problems getting a work product that we can
13 use.

14 Next slide. Okay. Going downhill to Crissy
15 Field, the Skeet Range, we owe DTSC a final Field
16 Data Report and Work Plan. We sent out drafts some
17 time ago, but Bob needs finals so that then he can
18 approve the cleanup plan that we want to do. We
19 will be sending those documents. We need to send
20 them back through the Park Service for one more
21 look-see. That will be happening shortly, and then
22 we'll be sending them off to Bob.

23 We're also going to start the bidding process.
24 We have a set of plans and specs ready to go. I'd
25 actually hoped to have the complete process going

1 MR. FORD: Yes. Well, the truth is, we
2 don't were precisely how many tanks we have. We
3 have an estimate.

4 MR. SUTTER: Oh, so you're trying to get
5 the inspector to oversee a bunch of tanks. It's
6 not just this particular one.

7 MR. FORD: That's where I'm worried. This
8 one, we'll get out one way or the other. What I'm
9 more worried about is, we have paperwork that
10 suggests there could be as many as 56 tanks still
11 in the ground on the Presidio.

12 MR. BERMAN: Not in the dust bowl?

13 MR. FORD: No, not in the dust bowl. We
14 hope this will be the only thing we find in the
15 dust bowl. Those are the ones I'm really worried
16 about. This dust bowl is just kind of like, we
17 discovered we had a problem. It's more the
18 progress of getting the rest of those tanks out
19 that I'm worried about.

20 MR. SUTTER: If you run into a stone wall,
21 I might be able to help as a former city employee.
22 I know a few people here and there.

23 MR. FORD: Well, I may be coming to talk
24 to you shortly. It's taken us a long time to get
25 this going. We'd kind-of like to pick up speed

1 by now, but we haven't quite made it yet. But it
2 will be started next week or so. We'll be getting
3 bids from multiple contractors to do the work, and
4 a presumption we do the work in the spring.

5 MR. O'HARA: At the risk of beating a dead
6 horse here, how are you going to get the stuff
7 (INAUDIBLE) the mean tide level?

8 MR. FORD: What I want to do is what the
9 contractors tell us how they want to do it. The
10 specification we have is more of a -- it's a
11 performance specification that says these holes
12 have to be excavated and material has to be legally
13 disposed offsite. You tell us how to do it, and
14 then we'll take a close look. If somebody comes up
15 with a proposal and anything's goofy, we won't give
16 them the work. But what we're trying to do is
17 kind-of encourage the (INAUDIBLE) and creativity of
18 the contractors, and hope that they may have a
19 better solution for doing it than we do.

20 MS. YAROS: George, I'm not clear. Where
21 is this cleanup? Crissy Field looks as though it's
22 finished.

23 MR. FORD: This is right on the beach. It
24 isn't going to affect any of the sort-of finished
25 improved parts of Crissy Field. This is on the

1 beach near the west end of the marsh. The work is
2 occurring really right out on the front slope of
3 the beach.

4 MS. YAROS: So it's not a real big area.

5 MR. FORD: No, it isn't. It will be
6 visible when work's going on. There will be heavy
7 equipment there, and probably the most noticeable
8 thing will be that we will have to haul the sand
9 and skeet fragments that we remove out the
10 Promenade. So there will be party-loaded trucks
11 moving out on the Promenade. I would say,
12 generally speaking, most people aren't going to
13 notice that it's going on. Joggers who go out on
14 the Promenade on the beach are definitely going to
15 see it, but if you're just driving by on Mason
16 Street you probably would have to know that
17 something is happening in order to see it. It
18 should happen relatively quickly. I'm expecting it
19 will take something like two weeks to do the whole
20 job.

21 MS. YAROS: It's also in that area that
22 comes with the public restrooms?

23 MR. FORD: No. This is a -- I'm sorry I
24 don't have a map.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a few hundred yards

1 east of the Coast Guard Station. And if you're to
2 walk along the beach from the Coast Guard Station
3 to the east, you'll get to the point where the
4 beach is interrupted by rocks and riprap. That's
5 the location. It's on both sides of the riprap.
6 The beach is clean, if the riprap is clean again,
7 and it's just surrounding that riprap.

8 MS. YAROS: Thank you.

9 MR. FORD: And another Crissy Field item,
10 we're sending out a Building 937 follow up and
11 Closure Plan that's coming out? That's actually
12 being sent to DTSC for their review and also to the
13 Water Board?

14 Then Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. I should
15 point out that they started cutting trees in
16 Landfill 4 two weeks ago. The trees are all down
17 and most of the logs are gone, and they're just
18 grinding up the brush to turn it into mulch. Tree
19 removal at Fill Site 5 will start next Monday. So
20 that shall go a little faster. It should be all
21 done within 10 days to two weeks.

22 Where we are administratively on this project
23 is that the ARARs are still an issue. We're hoping
24 to get the ARARs in final form. We still welcome
25 any comments you might have on the preliminary

1 draft that we sent out. We think that the official
2 draft review period -- we are still shooting for
3 the month of January, with the 30-day public review
4 period will essentially be the month of January and
5 the public meeting will occur in mid- to
6 late-January when we present the report.

7 I don't anticipate any changes in that
8 schedule. I hope we've turned a corner on ARARs.
9 Right now I think the only thing that could derail
10 that schedule is an ARARs problem. But I hope that
11 we turned a corner, and now with ARARs, they're
12 getting better and not worse. And so we will be
13 able to get the Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 ARARs
14 final and put them into the draft, so that the
15 draft can then reviewed.

16 MS. HARRIS: Where are those public
17 meetings held?

18 MR. FORD: It's most likely to be held
19 here. As a general rule, we're going to try to
20 make the public meetings on the same day as the RAB
21 meeting. Normally what we'll try to do is convene
22 the public meeting say at 6:00 o'clock and run it
23 from six to seven, and then the regular RAB meeting
24 can start at seven.

25 Now having said that, we probably will not have

1 this meeting in January on the same day as the RAB
2 meeting. We have some people who are going to be
3 out of town in early January, and when we do the
4 public meeting, we want to have all the important
5 players there at the meeting. So it's likely that
6 we'll do it in the second half of January. I don't
7 know what the date is at the moment, but we are
8 going to be proposing a date pretty soon, and so
9 we'll send that around.

10 MS. WRIGHT: George, there has been some
11 talk of putting signs up? I wonder if you guys
12 have had any comments if any have been pulled down
13 (INAUDIBLE) in the Landfill 4 area?

14 MR. FORD: Unless the signs already got
15 removed, there were some signs up.

16 MR. O'HARA: There were signs up. I saw
17 them.

18 MS. WRIGHT: I went there twice and didn't
19 see it.

20 MR. FORD: The signs were out on Central
21 Magazine Road, where we were closing the gates.

22 MS. WRIGHT: Oh, they're on the trail?

23 MR. FORD: They should be, but now you've
24 got me wondering. We'll have to check. We'll have
25 to check.

1 MS. WRIGHT: In the really obvious places
2 where the road's being blocked off, and there's no
3 sign there except for the temporary road barrier.

4 MR. FORD: I'll take a look tomorrow
5 morning because there were signs there. They
6 should still should be there.

7 MS. WRIGHT: I just didn't see them, and I
8 didn't think it should be that hard to see.

9 MR. NELSON: There may not have been a
10 sign before the road barricade, and so it was
11 blocked because they didn't want people going in
12 and getting hurt.

13 MS. PACKER: If they were placed behind
14 the barricade, well, that doesn't make any sense.
15 We moved them outside the barricade. There's one
16 on the trail and then --

17 MS. WRIGHT: It's just on the other side
18 of the (INAUDIBLE) where people would stop would be
19 a logical place to put it.

20 MS. PACKER: Yes. I'll get that tomorrow.

21 MS. WRIGHT: Especially because Fill Site
22 5 will be a little more public. So those signs
23 will be up before the trees are pulled down on
24 Monday?

25 MR. FORD: They're scheduled to go up next

1 trouble out there so far.

2 MR. BERMAN: Everything was so
3 well-packaged that nothing got out, you mean?

4 MR. FORD: Well, presumably, if they
5 spilled anything, it blew up, I guess.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: (INAUDIBLE) that they did
7 do a test for batteries (INAUDIBLE) leaked. They
8 did have some light samples for explosive
9 compounds. The Army put out a fairly brief report
10 on that.

11 MR. KERN: Very brief.

12 MR. FORD: I think the plan is we'll keep
13 using Central Magazine for storage. It's pretty
14 secure storage because the bombproof door is there
15 and tough for the vandals to get through.

16 The last thing on this is that the Fish and
17 Wildlife Service has asked to review our Erosion
18 Control Plans for this site. We're trying to
19 comply with their request. We told them there
20 would be two plans, one for the construction phase
21 and one for a post-construction after we've removed
22 the fill.

23 They asked to see both of them. We had a
24 little bit of an issue because we want the
25 Construction Phase Plan to be written by the

1 week. We're probably a little closer than I would
2 like.

3 MS. WRIGHT: That will be the more visible
4 -- you kind-of have to go up the road to see them.

5 MR. BERMAN: Adjacent to Landfill 4,
6 you've got that old artillery site?

7 MR. FORD: Central Magazine?

8 MR. BERMAN: Right. Is that going to
9 remain there? If it's going to remain, will it be
10 closed off?

11 MR. FORD: Yes. The Trust is actually
12 using that for dry storage right now. I think the
13 plan is to keep using it for that in the
14 foreseeable future.

15 MS. WRIGHT: What kind of dry storage?

16 MR. FORD: For instance, our Asbestos
17 (INAUDIBLE) approves, they keep flat rolls of
18 plastic and stuff like that. They have pallets of
19 plastic and that sort of stuff.

20 MR. BERMAN: There is no CAP plan for that
21 building at all?

22 MR. FORD: As far as cleaning up? As far
23 as we know, there isn't any contamination out
24 there. Central Magazine is where they stored their
25 heavy-weight munitions. We have not identified any

1 contractor who's going to do the work so that they
2 can write a plan that will fit with their
3 operation.

4 Brian has suggested a path out of this dilemma,
5 and we're using his suggestion. What we're going
6 to send to the Fish and Wildlife Service is a
7 Perimeter Erosion Control Plan, where the Trust
8 will install some hay bales and sandbags and a few
9 other measures around the perimeter of Fill Site 5
10 to control any erosion and make sure no silt gets
11 off of the site. But we will leave the erosion
12 control measures for the center part of the site to
13 be determined by the contractor who is selected to
14 do the work.

15 MR. BOGGS: What we could also do is
16 actually have some minimum specs for erosion
17 control of your contractors that he put in the
18 scope of work. Not that you have to specify
19 exactly what they're going to do, but you specify
20 some minimum specs that may satisfy the Fish and
21 Wildlife Service as well. So we will require it of
22 your contractor, and as Best Management Practices
23 require.

24 MR. FORD: That's a good idea. What we're
25 trying to do here is have our cake and eat it too, and

Page 85

1 satisfy the Fish and Wildlife that we're doing the
2 right thing but not tie the hands of the contractor
3 too much.

4 MR. PONTON: (INAUDIBLE) permit for
5 construction.

6 MR. FORD: Do you know what the size
7 threshold needs to be --

8 MR. PONTON: It needs to be 5 acres.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Has it decreased yet?

10 MR. PONTON: It's in the process. I'm not
11 sure (INAUDIBLE).

12 MR. FORD: Okay.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Jim, doesn't that permit
14 fall within the RAP? The RAP would supersede the
15 on-site permit requirements (INAUDIBLE) if they
16 start to comply with the functional requirements?

17 MR. PONTON: I don't know.

18 MR. FORD: We will be talking to you about
19 that. Thanks.

20 I think we have one more slide. I love these
21 kind of pictures. We've been working on Landfill
22 4/Fill Site 5 for a while. Two weeks ago was the
23 first time we actually physically did anything on
24 the site. I'm generally not in favor of cutting
25 down trees, but I have to admit it was nice to

Page 87

1 I do plan to finalize them and get those moving. I
2 do plan to be a little more involved than I have
3 been in the last month.

4 The other thing I'd like to say is that I think
5 it's pretty important that we see the groundwater
6 monitoring results for this site, given that there
7 has clearly been no results collected in the last
8 couple years, before we can really look at the FS
9 and make a proper evaluation of what's being
10 described in there. So I'm anxious to see those
11 groundwater results for FS evaluation. That's
12 about it.

13 MR. KERN: Any questions for Jim? Any new
14 business?

15 MS. CHEEVER: Not really new business.
16 But I have a minor suggestion or request about
17 meetings. While at the same time thanking the
18 Trust for the various informative presentations, I
19 think sometimes a map would help both for us RAB
20 members and also for people in the public. I don't
21 know if you could just at least have a large
22 posterboard map that we could refer to, or I don't
23 know if it's technologically possible to have a map
24 on the slide that you can refer to without using
25 the order of your other slides and even have a

Page 86

1 actually see something happen on this site.

2 MR. NELSON: It's a lot sunnier up there
3 now.

4 MR. FORD: Yes. A big window has been cut
5 into the eucalyptus. Give it a few more days for
6 all the brush to be chipped, and then we should be
7 removing the road barricades. If you're driving
8 around or walking out there, just go down Central
9 Magazine and take a look. You can see the limits
10 of the landfill, and you can see what we'll be
11 working on next spring. That's it for me. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. KERN: Bob. Any update from you?

14 MR. BOGGS: I think I've interjected
15 enough already.

16 MR. KERN: Jim?

17 MR. PONTON: Just a couple things. I just
18 want to explain that in early September, I wrote a
19 letter explaining that staffing issues -- basically
20 I've been working a lot at Hamilton, that I'd be
21 not spending as much time on the Presidio until
22 December. So next week we take Hamilton to the
23 Board, or the week after next to the Board, and
24 after that I should have a lot more time. So I do
25 plan to -- I've sketched out comments on the ARARs.

Page 88

1 closeup. Because it seems there's constantly
2 questions about where is this.

3 MR. NELSON: We have a big
4 posterboard-size map with a laser pointer. We can
5 indicate the location.

6 MR. FORD: Yes. We'll bring that. We can
7 also do closeups for specific sites, put them on
8 the slides. I think that's a good idea.

9 MR. SUTTER: I had a question regarding
10 the site. I'd like at some point to be able to see
11 the various sites being worked on, or planned to be
12 worked on. I understand that periodically there
13 are tours that are given to RAB members, and maybe
14 there are other members that would be interested in
15 spending half a day and just eye-balling what
16 you're considering. I don't know if that would
17 impact upon the Trust's work schedule.

18 MR. FORD: We can do that. The only thing
19 I would suggest is that, from my own experience, a
20 half a day touring, that's a huge bite in terms of
21 nobody can stand to listen to me babbling for four
22 hours at a crack. It might make more sense to do a
23 couple of them that are an hour or two long just
24 because it's a little easier to assimilate
25 information if you're not seeing 15 different sites

1 in on outing.

2 MR. SUTTER: I'd be most sensitive to your
3 time requirements or whoever it would be. I'm
4 pretty flexible.

5 MR. FORD: We can set that up. We'll put
6 our heads together and propose something.

7 MR. NELSON: We did one last fall for the
8 new RAB members. One was only about an hour and a
9 half. It was in the evening. The season right now
10 is not such a great time to do an evening
11 unfortunately because it gets dark at 5:30.

12 MR. FORD: That's better; then they can't
13 see.

14 MR. O'HARA: The Trust conducted one at
15 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 last summer, and we met
16 before and we walked the area up there before the
17 meeting. And I would think that from your
18 standpoint, seeing this in daylight, if you can
19 bear with it until April, until daylight saving
20 time kicks in again, it would be a lot more
21 beneficial.

22 The other thing is to get a map of what's going
23 on and drive or walk around and take a look at it,
24 and then take a guided tour and the specifics of
25 what's going on or where in the process we are.

1 to be able to do a self-guided tour. If I was, I
2 could do it at that way. I'd really love to get
3 the technical information at the same time that I
4 actually eye-ball.

5 MR. NELSON: We'll get Jane to send out a
6 map of all the sites to all the new RAB members as
7 soon as possible. We'll work on getting the
8 daytime tour going for those people who can attend.

9 MR. BOGGS: You can propose some dates for
10 it.

11 MR. NELSON: Is everyone reachable by
12 E-mail during the day?

13 MR. SUTTER: Jane has my fax at home.

14 MR. KERN: Any other new items? I have a
15 brief question. I'm wondering if anyone tonight is
16 prepared to talk about sites like Landfill 4/Fill
17 Site 5 that might be being pushed out ahead,
18 possible remediation, and more near-term kind-of
19 scheduling like Baker Beach 3-kinds of -- we didn't
20 hear anything about that. Is that kind of in the
21 planning stage or --

22 MR. FORD: Yeah, they are. Our current
23 thinking is that we would like to clean up Baker
24 Beach Disturbed Area 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6 next
25 summer. And so in order -- not knowing whether the

1 MR. SUTTER: Again, I'm retired, and I've
2 got lots of time on my hands, so daytime wouldn't
3 be difficult for me. But again, I wouldn't want to
4 impinge upon --

5 MR. FORD: No, that's relatively easy to
6 do if you're available in the daytime. We could
7 set something up pretty quickly.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Does (INAUDIBLE) for the
9 new RAB members which ones are available during
10 weekdays generally?

11 MS. HARRIS: I'd like to echo what you're
12 saying. I'm also available during the day and
13 would be pleased to have a tour.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Peter had a good point.
15 In the springtime, it's a lot easier to do it early
16 evening and catch more people who have other
17 commitments during the day. But there are a number
18 of things that are going to come up between now and
19 April. I think you're going to want some
20 foundation for the discussion. It would be good if
21 we just focused on those things that are more
22 likely to be at the heart of the discussion. It
23 would certainly help you participate.

24 MR. SUTTER: I'd really appreciate that.
25 I'm not that familiar yet with the entire process

1 Feasibility Study will go final, we don't have a
2 base-wide RAP until the Feasibility Study goes
3 final. We're thinking the way to ensure that we
4 could do a significant chunk of work next summer
5 would probably be to pull those sites out and give
6 them their own RAP. The Trust is -- We're taking
7 steps down that path right now. We're trying to
8 get the contracts in place. That's another thing
9 that will be up on the radar screen shortly. We
10 don't have a whole lot to report right now, but I
11 would say that by January, we will start having
12 things to report.

13 MR. KERN: Anything else under Item 9?
14 Action Items. These are the 103 things that George
15 committed to do tonight.

16 List of objectives on the Landfill E to be
17 circulated. You committed to do a map of the
18 groundwater program for Sam, for every single one
19 of them.

20 MR. FORD: Right. It's going to be a map.

21 MR. KERN: You committed to finding out
22 the release of the groundwater report date. And
23 that's (INAUDIBLE).

24 There is a variety of things too numerous to
25 mention around the LAIR project that you're in deep

1 on now, I'm sure.
 2 The 1065 CAP is coming out. That's kind of on
 3 our plate to review that when that comes up. It
 4 appears that there is a little message from Jim
 5 about a possible permit issue. And there's maps
 6 for RAB members. There's going to be a tour
 7 proposed. Those are some of the things that I
 8 found.
 9 There's a small proposal that was made at the
 10 (INAUDIBLE) about portable heaters for the next
 11 meeting?
 12 MS. WRIGHT: Ergonomic chairs?
 13 MR. KERN: Ergonomic chairs. Anything
 14 else for action items?
 15 Agenda Items. Dennis, before he left,
 16 mentioned to me to try to get on our next committee
 17 meeting a rundown of the budget. We've had that
 18 previously at committee meetings. It would be
 19 great if we could have something like that at our
 20 next committee meeting.
 21 Okay. Any other agenda items coming up?
 22 MR. YOUNGKIN: We're putting out a new
 23 roster pretty soon, I believe. So if anybody has
 24 any additions or changes to the addresses --
 25 MS. PACKER: I put that in the mail last

1 week. It should be in your mailboxes, if not
 2 today, tomorrow.
 3 MR. FORD: We're also going to do name
 4 plates for new RAB members who don't have them.
 5 MS. WRIGHT: And Jane, this is kind of
 6 minor, but people keep mailing things to my old
 7 address, so if you could check the database and use
 8 the current one for mailing.
 9 MR. FORD: Why do you move around so much?
 10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Tax reasons.
 11 MR. KERN: Are there any other items
 12 tonight? Any announcements? Without any further
 13 ado, meeting adjourned. Thanks for coming out
 14 tonight.
 15 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
 16 9:45 p.m.)
 17 ---oOo---
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 ATTENDANCE
 2 RAB MEMBERS
 3 Jerry Anderson
 4 Sam Berman
 5 Joel Berman
 6 Bob Boggs, EKI
 7 Julie Cheever
 8 Craig Cooper
 9 Dennis Downing
 10 George Ford
 11 Matt Fottler
 12 Willard Harris
 13 Doug Kern
 14 Scott Miller
 15 Jan Monaghan
 16 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
 17 Peter O'Hara
 18 Jane Packer
 19 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
 20 David Sutter
 21 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
 22 Tracy Wright
 23 Gloria Yaros
 24 ---oOo---
 25

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25